

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, March 11, 1994

The House met at 10 a.m.
The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

As the Sun shines down from high and gives light and warmth to the open spaces and the darkest corner, so may Your grace touch every person with that same light and warmth. Illuminate our hearts so we can see more clearly our faults and, provided with the freedom of forgiveness, we will grow and mature to be people of integrity and see others with compassion and mercy. This is our earnest prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 148, not voting 60, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—225

Ackerman	Bryant	DeFazio
Andrews (ME)	Callahan	DeLauro
Andrews (NJ)	Cantwell	Dellums
Applegate	Cardin	Derrick
Bacchus (FL)	Carr	Deutsch
Baesler	Clayton	Dicks
Barca	Clement	Dingell
Barca	Clyburn	Durbin
Barlow	Coleman	Edwards (CA)
Barrett (WI)	Collins (MI)	Engel
Bateman	Combest	English
Becerra	Condit	Eshoo
Beilenson	Conyers	Evans
Berman	Cooper	Everett
Bevill	Coppersmith	Farr
Bilbray	Costello	Fazio
Blackwell	Coyne	Fields (LA)
Bonior	Cramer	Filner
Borski	Danner	Fingerhut
Boucher	Darden	Flake
Brewster	de la Garza	Foglietta
Browder	Deal	Ford (MI)

Frost	Lowey	Sabo
Furse	Mann	Sanders
Gejdenson	Manton	Sangmeister
Geren	Margolies-	Santorum
Gillmor	Mezvinsky	Sarpalius
Gilman	Markey	Sawyer
Glickman	Martinez	Schenk
Gonzalez	Matsui	Schumer
Gordon	Mazzoli	Scott
Green	McCollum	Serrano
Hall (OH)	McCurdy	Sharp
Hall (TX)	McHale	Shepherd
Hamburg	McKinney	Sisisky
Hamilton	McNulty	Skaggs
Harman	Meek	Skelton
Hefner	Menendez	Slughter
Hilliard	Mfume	Smith (IA)
Hinchey	Mineta	Spratt
Hoagland	Minge	Stark
Hochbrueckner	Mink	Stenholm
Holden	Moakley	Stokes
Houghton	Mollohan	Strickland
Hoyer	Montgomery	Studds
Hughes	Murtha	Stupak
Hutto	Myers	Swett
Hyde	Nadler	Swift
Inglis	Neal (MA)	Synar
Insee	Oberstar	Tanner
Johnson (GA)	Obey	Tauzin
Johnson (SD)	Oliver	Tejeda
Johnson, E.B.	Ortiz	Thompson
Johnston	Pallone	Thornton
Kanjorski	Parker	Thurman
Kaptur	Pastor	Torricelli
Kasich	Payne (NJ)	Traficant
Kennedy	Payne (VA)	Tucker
Kennelly	Penny	Unsoeld
Kildee	Peterson (FL)	Valentine
Kingston	Peterson (MN)	Velazquez
Klecza	Pickett	Visclosky
Klein	Pickle	Volkmer
Klink	Pombo	Waters
LaFalce	Pomeroy	Watt
Lambert	Poshard	Waxman
Lancaster	Price (NC)	Wheat
Lantos	Rahall	Williams
LaRocco	Rangel	Wilson
Laughlin	Reed	Wise
Lehman	Richardson	Woolsey
Levin	Roemer	Wyden
Lewis (GA)	Rose	Wynn
Lipinski	Rowland	Yates
Lloyd	Roybal-Allard	
Long	Rush	

NAYS—148

Allard	Cunningham	Hastert
Archer	DeLay	Hefley
Armey	Diaz-Balart	Hobson
Bachus (AL)	Dickey	Hoekstra
Baker (CA)	Doolittle	Hoke
Baker (LA)	Dornan	Horn
Ballenger	Dreier	Huffington
Barrett (NE)	Duncan	Hunter
Bartlett	Dunn	Hutchinson
Bereuter	Ehlers	Inhofe
Billirakis	Emerson	Istook
Bliley	Ewing	Jacobs
Blute	Fawell	Johnson (CT)
Boehert	Fowler	Johnson, Sam
Boehner	Franks (CT)	Kim
Bonilla	Franks (NJ)	King
Bunning	Gallely	Klug
Burton	Gekas	Knollenberg
Calvert	Gilchrest	Kolbe
Camp	Gingrich	Kreidler
Canady	Goodlatte	Kyl
Castle	Goodling	Lazio
Clay	Goss	Leach
Clinger	Grams	Levy
Coble	Grandy	Lewis (FL)
Collins (GA)	Gunderson	Linder
Cox	Hancock	Livingston
Crapo	Hansen	Machtley

McCandless	Regula	Spence
McDade	Ridge	Stearns
McHugh	Roberts	Stump
McInnis	Rogers	Sundquist
McKeon	Rohrabacher	Talent
Meyers	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (MS)
Mica	Roth	Taylor (NC)
Michel	Roukema	Thomas (CA)
Miller (FL)	Royce	Torkildsen
Molinari	Saxton	Upton
Murphy	Schaefer	Vento
Nussle	Schiff	Vucanovich
Oxley	Schroeder	Walker
Packard	Sensenbrenner	Walsh
Paxon	Shays	Weldon
Petri	Shuster	Wolf
Portman	Skeen	Young (AK)
Pryce (OH)	Smith (MI)	Young (FL)
Quillen	Smith (NJ)	Zeliff
Quinn	Smith (OR)	Zimmer
Ramstad	Smith (TX)	
Ravenel	Snowe	

NOT VOTING—60

Abercrombie	Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)
Andrews (TX)	Gallo	Moorhead
Barton	Gephardt	Moran
Bentley	Gibbons	Morella
Bishop	Greenwood	Natcher
Brooks	Gutierrez	Neal (NC)
Brown (CA)	Hastings	Orton
Brown (FL)	Hayes	Owens
Brown (OH)	Herger	Pelosi
Buyer	Jefferson	Porter
Byrne	Kopetski	Reynolds
Chapman	Lewis (CA)	Rostenkowski
Collins (IL)	Lightfoot	Shaw
Crane	Maloney	Slattery
Dixon	Manzullo	Solomon
Dooley	McCloskey	Thomas (WY)
Edwards (TX)	McCrery	Torres
Fields (TX)	McDermott	Towns
Fish	McMillan	Washington
Ford (TN)	Meehan	Whitten

□ 1023

Mr. PAXON changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I missed the vote on approving the Journal because I was at the White House for President Clinton's announcement about the Western Hemispheric Conference in Miami. Had I been here I would have voted "yea" on rollcall 53.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Will the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 282. An act to provide Federal recognition of the Mowa Band of Choctaw Indians of Alabama.

S.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to designate the week of May 2 through May 8, 1994, as "Public Service Recognition Week."

S.J. Res. 151. Joint resolution designating the week of April 10 through 16, 1994, as "Primary Immune Deficiency Awareness Week."

S.J. Res. 162. Joint resolution designating March 25, 1994, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy."

S.J. Res. 163. Joint resolution to proclaim March 20, 1994, as "National Agriculture Day."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that he will take five 1-minutes on each side.

FIRESAFE CIGARETTES?

(Mr. MOAKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call your attention to the Justice Department's investigation into the possibility of an agreement amongst cigarette manufacturers to suppress product research and development on firesafe cigarettes. I commend the Justice Department for investigating whether the cigarette companies have had a gentlemen's agreement not to put these cigarettes into the marketplace.

For 15 years I have been pushing for legislation calling for cigarettes that are less likely to cause fires. My previous bills have laid the groundwork for H.R. 3885, which requires the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate fire safety standards in 1 year and requires cigarette manufacturers to comply within another year. We cannot afford further delays.

Since I started working on this issue more than 20,000 people have been killed by cigarette-related fires and thousands more have been seriously injured. Many of the victims are innocent children. How does a mother tell a young boy he has to go through life seriously disfigured because the guy in the apartment next door fell asleep with a burning cigarette in his hand.

Fires caused by carelessly discarded cigarettes can be prevented. The cigarette manufacturers are able to produce such cigarettes. In fact, there are five of these cigarettes already in the marketplace. More White Lights

120's. More 120's, Virginia Slims Superslims 100s, Capri Lights 100s, and Eve Lights 120s, are proven to reduce fires. Each company has a firesafe cigarette and they have a moral and legal obligation to make all cigarettes firesafe.

We cannot afford further delays in calling for all cigarettes to be firesafe. For every year that passes more than 1,200 people die and thousands more are maimed or permanently disfigured. My legislation will require that the cigarette manufacturers sell firesafe cigarettes. Please join me in protecting our Nation's children from these insidious fires.

I submit the Washington Post article for the RECORD:

FIRE-SAFE CIGARETTES?

(By Michael J. Sniffen)

The Justice Department is investigating whether tobacco companies illegally agreed not to produce or sell cigarettes that are less likely to start fires.

Justice Department spokeswoman Gina Talamona said this week that, "the antitrust division is conducting an investigation into the possibility of agreement among cigarette companies to suppress product research and development regarding fire-safe cigarettes."

Vic Han, a spokesman for Philip Morris Cos., said there has been "absolutely no suppression" of such products.

Talamona said the department has issued civil investigative demands, which are the equivalent of subpoenas in the division's civil antitrust investigations. But she would not say what companies had received them or discuss details of the investigation.

Andrew McGuire of the Trauma Foundation in San Francisco, which lobbies for fire-safe cigarettes, said the investigation appears to have begun about four months ago.

McGuire said fire-safe cigarettes are feasible but that tobacco companies have resisted marketing them because "they don't want the fallout of product liability lawsuits over burn deaths and burn injuries caused by their current cigarettes."

Peggy Carter of Reynolds Tobacco in Winston-Salem, N.C., said the company acknowledged existence of the Justice Department investigation in a footnote to a recent stock filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission. She said SEC rules prevented her from commenting further.

In New York, Han said, "I can confirm that Philip Morris USA has received a civil investigative demand from the antitrust division . . . in an investigation of possible joint activity among United States manufacturers in the production and sale of cigarettes including possible joint activities to limit new product development, specifically in the area of reduced ignition propensity cigarettes."

There were 1,220 deaths, 3,358 injuries and \$400 million in property damage from 44,000 cigarette-ignited fires in 1990, the most recent year with complete data, according to the Center for Fire Research of the government's National Institute of Standards and Technology.

A campaign to persuade the tobacco companies to produce fire-safe cigarettes was begun in 1978 by McGuire's Trauma Foundation, which seeks to prevent injuries and injury-related deaths. The trauma organization, which is supported by foundation

grants and funds from the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, is located in San Francisco General Hospital.

"There's no doubt the industry has known for a long time how to make fire-safe cigarettes and hasn't done it," said Northeastern University law professor Richard Daynard of the Tobacco Projects Liability Project, "because if a really safe cigarette is available that would open the companies to lawsuits over the ones that aren't safe."

Asked to comment on the government's investigation and the longstanding charges of suppression, Walker Merryman of the Tobacco Institute, an industry group, said, "Anything having to do with litigation is something we never comment on."

A CLEAR CHOICE

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, as we debate the budget today on the House floor, I urge my colleagues to ask the question: Which budget alternative meets the needs of the middle-class family?

The Republican alternative has middle-class tax relief. The Democrat budget continues the President's higher taxes and spending of the future generations of the middle class' own money.

The Republican alternative includes spending for anticrime measures. The Democrat alternative does not.

The Republican budget pays for real health care reform. The majority budget does not.

The Republican budget includes welfare reform. The President still does not even have a welfare reform plan.

The Republican budget cuts spending first, by slashing spending \$152 billion more than the Democrat budget alternative.

Mr. Speaker, the choice is clear. If you want middle-class tax relief, anticrime measures, health care reform, welfare reform, and real deficit reduction, you will support the Republican budget. If you want the status quo, you will vote for the Clinton budget.

PUT YOUR MONEY WHERE YOUR MOUTH IS: SUPPORT BALANCED BUDGET ACT

(Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to propose a resolution that will force this body to put its money where its mouth is.

Odds are we will soon vote on the balanced budget amendment. And odds are it will pass, as we all know that it failed in the other body and our votes on it this year will therefore be irrelevant.

It is odd that a gimmick like the balanced budget amendment will be able

to garner enough votes for final passage, but a real step towards reducing our deficit like the Penny-Kasich amendment, which would have cut spending \$90 billion over the next 5 years, failed.

By debating the balanced budget amendment, and by supporting it knowing that our votes are meaningless, we deceive the American people into thinking that we are actually doing something about the deficit when the sad truth is we are not.

Today I introduce the Real Balanced Budget Act, or the put your money where your mouth is act. It will force us to actually balance the budget 2 years in a row before we can talk about any constitutional amendment. It will ensure that we make substantive cuts and not just great-sounding, but empty, speeches.

Support the Real Balanced Budget Act. Put your money where your mouth is.

□ 1030

ALL BLUSTER, NO CHANGE

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when Bill Clinton ran for President, he promised the American people change and less spending. Looking at his budget proposal, the more the President talks about change, the more things stay the same. The President's status quo budget keeps higher taxes, cuts little, and, worse yet, health care, welfare, and crime are not even on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican alternative to the budget is a serious effort to enact real change. It reinvents government to save the taxpayers billions of dollars. It gives tax relief to middle class families, and it provides the funding for welfare reform, health care reform, and anticrime initiatives.

Mr. Speaker, it is time the President stops talking and starts acting. His budget is all bluster and no change.

ANOTHER AGENCY OUT OF CONTROL

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, let us see if something makes sense:

The CIA and the FBI said 3 years ago, "Aldridge Ames looks a little suspicious. He paid over a half million dollars in cash for his home in Virginia."

So, Mr. Speaker, they called him in, and Aldridge Ames said, "Hey, I got this ton of cash from my father-in-law in Colombia."

They said, "Wow. That explains it all. Thank you. Now we know where you got your money from."

My colleagues, Colombia is not exactly the Cocoa Puff capital of the world, and I think we have a CIA that was waiting to see Aldridge Ames light up cigars with hundred dollars bills or maybe see Boris Yeltsin do some half gainers in his swimming pool.

The truth of the matter is, Congress, we have got Barney Fife loose at the CIA. I do not buy that old shooting by the madman about a year and a half ago, and I think it is time for a little oversight on another agency out of control.

Mr. Speaker, we might start with the IRS, but I think we better look at the "central ignorance agency." It is starting to add up.

AN OPEN PROCESS

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, the American people have learned one thing about the Clinton administration: You have to verify every thing the White House says, because it is not always the whole truth.

We learned from the President's first budget that his rhetoric aside, he was still a tax-and-spend liberal.

We learned from his health care plan that there was a whole lot more Government than the public was ready to accept, despite the President's pronouncements.

And we now are learning that when it comes to Whitewater, the legislative branch should have a role in deciding if there were any improprieties.

An open process is not a luxury with the Clinton administration. It is a necessity. That is why, Mr. Speaker, we need to have hearings on the Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan. The Congress should probe into the details of the Whitewater Co.

If the American people have learned one thing about the Clinton White House, it is this: We need to see for ourselves what the story really is.

COLORADO NATIONAL GUARD SETS THE PACE FOR THE REST OF THE COUNTRY

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well to brag. I come to the well to brag as a Coloradan because we are all so proud of the Colorado National Guard.

Mr. Speaker, maybe some of my colleagues have seen what they have been doing. They setup a M*A*S*H type operation in down town Denver and have been delivering medical services to all sorts of homeless people who have not been near any kind of medical service in years. It is a very touching and mov-

ing operation. But I think for American taxpayers it is also wonderful to see this kind of operation going on at home, on the home shores for Americans, and I hope that National Guards across the country are challenged by this and do the same kind of outreach in many of our American cities where these terrible crises have been allowed to grow and grow and grow with no one answering back.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Colorado National Guard, "You have really set the pace for the rest of the country, and we all thank you."

MORE MISSION THAN CENTS

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, in the mayhem to move the budget resolution, the Budget Committee has recommended a major reduction in the Coast Guard acquisition, construction and improvements account. With less than 24 hours to review the 227-page report, many of us nearly missed this damaging cut. A full \$100 million below the President's request, this recommendation is pennywise and pound-foolish. The Federal Government is already straining and failing to control illegal immigration—we all know that we must maintain adequate capability at our maritime borders.

Additionally, the Coast Guard is an organization that we have given more missions than cents—as in dollars and cents. Its duty list is vast, growing, and very costly to fulfill. By failing to provide adequate funding for fiscal year 1995, we doom the Coast Guard to an endless game of catch-up, we risk abandoning Americans to needless danger on the high seas, and we send a steady green light signal to high seas smugglers and drug runners rather than the flashing blue lights of Coast Guard enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, we must correct the budget.

DETROIT WELCOMES PRESIDENT CLINTON'S JOBS SUMMIT

(Miss COLLINS of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some members of the media are proclaiming that next week's jobs summit in Detroit for the leaders of the world's industrial nations is useless or irrelevant. These pronouncements are beyond belief.

I applaud President Clinton for selecting Detroit for the summit, a city whose manufacturing jobs have plummeted from 400,000 to 100,000, a city that has been battered by governmental neglect, unfair imports, and

trickle down economics that never trickled down.

How can they say that a meeting called to discuss job creation is irrelevant? Tell that to the father who worked in the auto factory for 20 years and saw his job disappear. Tell that to the African-American who lined up with thousands of others for Post Office jobs that do not even exist yet.

It is easy for a safely ensconced, inside-the-Beltway journalist or a comfortable Ivy League academic who never saw a day of unemployment in his life to say that the President's jobs summit is useless.

Our doors are open in Detroit to the President and to world leaders as they join together to bring jobs to regions like mine, where unemployment last year averaged 13 percent and where among minorities today it is stuck at almost 20 percent.

We will show you firsthand how the lack of a job can tear apart a family and rip through communities like a tornado when you come to Detroit next week.

IT IS TIME FOR CONGRESS TO INVESTIGATE WHITEWATERGATE

(Mr. HORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, it looks like we are beginning to have a real problem here.

For months, we have been reading stories surrounding the strange saga of a failed savings and loan in Arkansas.

We have been prepared with reports alleging financial shenanigans, questionable campaign financing, document shredding, stonewalling and obstruction of justice. The President's personal attorney has committed suicide.

The White House counsel has resigned under fire and 10 White House aides have been subpoenaed to testify before a Federal grand jury. This reads as if it is an unbelievable novel, and the Democratic congressional leadership has steadfastly refused to convene any kind of an investigation.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of smoke here. And the Congress has constitutional obligation to determine if there is a fire. Let us allow the appropriate committees to conduct an honest investigation. And let us lay this Whitewatergate matter to rest one way or another and get to work on the business of the country.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). The Chair will entertain one more 1 minute on each side of the aisle.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON'S MOVIN' MAVS

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, last year I was extremely honored to announce on the House floor that the University of Texas at Arlington wheelchair basketball champions captured their third consecutive national championship. They were the first wheelchair basketball team to visit the White House.

Well, they've done it again, and, in their own hometown. On March 9, the Movin' Mavs captured their fourth consecutive national championship at the NCAA final four wheelchair basketball tournament held at the University of Texas at Arlington.

I am very proud of this extraordinary team. The individual battle that each team member waged to overcome disability and become a champion is truly inspiring.

My congratulations go to the 1994 UTA Movin' Mavs wheelchair basketball team: James Anthony Hayes, coach; Lee Castillo, assistant coach; Henry Torres, assistant coach; Juan Pulido, manager; Raquel Delgado, trainer; Richard Ellis, statistician; Bobby Holcomb, Don Bradley Michael, Chhaly Mak, Phung Tran, Dennis Harrison, Jason C. Van Beek, Ciprian Falcon, Rusty Belknap, Javier Gonzalez, Jr., Cezar Olivas, and Hans Ostergaard.

□ 1040

IN SUPPORT OF THE KASICH REPUBLICAN BUDGET ALTERNATIVE

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Kasich budget resolution—it moves this Nation in the right direction, and for the most part, is consistent with the pressing need for our Nation to regain its prominence in the global economy.

And in this respect, I would commend to my colleagues attention a series of articles in the New York Times this week on "Staying Afloat in the 1990's." It is an excellent analysis of the fears and frustrations facing the American middle class. They are the stories of young college graduates who cannot find jobs, let alone good ones, and of hard-working Americans who see their jobs evaporating, next week or next year. These people rightfully see themselves falling, ever more rapidly, from the middle class. We must take action to reverse these trends.

The Kasich budget moves to get our fiscal house in order so that this generation of Americans and the next can confidently look toward a future of

good jobs at good pay, and a rightful place in a growing and economically secure middle class.

No, I don't agree with every detail of this budget. For example, I strongly oppose the \$500 tax credit per child, for those with \$200,000 per year incomes. If a deduction is included at all, there should be an income cap to target the deductions for middle-income families. But this can be taken up in the tax bill and appropriately targeted.

I also do not agree that cuts and adjusted means testing of higher income seniors and Medicare should be defined today. This needs much more work, and a much more thorough examination. Moreover, it should only be done, if at all, in the context of health care reform that preserves Medicare, and expands coverage for prescription drugs and extended care.

Nevertheless, the Kasich budget has great merit. It puts into concrete responsible spending and tax policies, and an economic blueprint for the country.

Our deficit and profligate spending ways are undermining our economy, both short-term and long-term. In other words, as I have repeated time after time over recent years like a mantra: We need to save and invest in America.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Kasich budget focuses in on that course. What we need to do is have a budget that forces us to save and invest in America. The Kasich budget moves us onto that course.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana). Pursuant to House Resolution 384 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 218.

□ 1043

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999, with Mr. SERRANO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, March 10, 1994, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] had been disposed of.

It is now in order to consider amendment numbered 3 printed in the House Report 103-429.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE
OFFERED BY MR. MFUME

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. MFUME:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995.

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1995, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, October 1, 1997, and October 1, 1998:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,340,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$1,410,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,478,765,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,555,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,629,943,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$0.
Fiscal year 1996: \$0.
Fiscal year 1997: \$0.
Fiscal year 1998: \$0.
Fiscal year 1999: \$0.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$100,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$106,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$111,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$117,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$123,700,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,528,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$1,615,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,697,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,775,163,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,870,310,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,513,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$1,587,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,671,560,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,741,837,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,830,136,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$173,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$176,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$192,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$185,913,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$200,193,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$4,968,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$5,293,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$5,640,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$5,996,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$6,367,300,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning

on October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, October 1, 1997, and October 1, 1998, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New direct loan obligations, \$26,700,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$199,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New direct loan obligations, \$32,100,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$174,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New direct loan obligations, \$33,800,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$164,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New direct loan obligations, \$35,700,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$164,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New direct loan obligations, \$37,800,000,000.
(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$163,500,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1995 through 1999 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, \$246,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$261,488,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, \$237,831,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$249,512,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$222,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$234,674,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, \$205,495,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$220,881,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, \$200,617,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$209,813,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,227,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,000,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, \$16,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,031,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,917,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$20,177,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,600,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,593,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$21,111,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$18,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,055,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$22,602,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$16,500,000,000.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, \$17,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$17,100,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,446,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,122,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:
(A) New budget authority, \$19,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,771,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:
(A) New budget authority, \$18,913,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,862,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,008,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$19,954,000,000.
(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 1995:
(A) New budget authority, \$5,923,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$5,086,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,400,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,375,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,189,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,590,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,411,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,560,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,179,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,540,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,187,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,508,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,194,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,838,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,518,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,171,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,666,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,297,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,676,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,354,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,249,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,942,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$10,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,224,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,482,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,700,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,878,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,018,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,700,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,269,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,543,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,800,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,918,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,208,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,400,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,655,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$7,501,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,800,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$117,900,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$130,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,485,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$11,394,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,000,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$103,200,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$110,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,134,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$3,104,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$95,400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$110,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,994,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$2,296,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,200,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$96,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$110,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,760,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,842,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$3,400,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$99,500,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$110,000,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,012,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,914,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$500,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,988,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,205,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,125,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,572,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,587,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,206,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,833,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,633,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,799,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,200,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$3,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,110,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,240,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,200,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$3,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,669,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$10,829,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,200,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$3,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,071,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,243,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,200,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$3,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,717,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,927,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,200,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$3,600,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$58,889,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$54,649,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$5,500,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$19,000,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,533,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$55,221,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$11,500,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$14,000,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,420,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,207,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$13,200,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$13,200,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,707,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,716,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,100,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$12,300,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,021,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,694,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,800,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$11,200,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$124,514,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$123,683,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$138,119,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$137,190,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$153,012,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$152,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$169,005,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$167,945,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$100,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$186,894,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$185,792,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$162,436,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$160,479,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,485,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$178,214,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$198,513,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$196,095,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$218,778,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$215,142,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$242,231,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$239,037,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$224,080,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$221,469,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$242,554,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$231,580,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$264,372,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$245,753,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$286,560,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$256,627,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$301,889,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$270,183,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$339,202,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$337,349,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$355,535,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$355,206,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$374,638,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$373,097,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1998:
 (A) New budget authority, \$393,364,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$391,774,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1999:
 (A) New budget authority, \$413,059,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$411,228,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 1995:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,756,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,288,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,400,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$32,900,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1996:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,584,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,050,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,300,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$27,400,000,000.
 (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
 Fiscal year 1997:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,755,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,803,000,000.
 (C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,400,000,000.
 (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$25,800,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,592,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,868,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$25,600,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,713,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,233,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$25,300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,926,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,999,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,820,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,085,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,086,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,919,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$23,421,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,551,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,775,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,104,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,087,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,231,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,813,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,129,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,559,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,708,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,079,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,233,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,915,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,094,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$213,668,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$213,666,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$230,021,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$230,021,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$241,215,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$241,215,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$252,050,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$252,050,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$263,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$263,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, -\$42,898,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$42,898,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, -\$37,512,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$37,512,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, -\$37,933,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$37,933,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, -\$39,474,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$39,474,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, -\$40,518,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$40,518,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I am not in opposition. I will just be recognized for 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] may control the time.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today, as we conclude this debate on the budget, in support of the alternative budget offered by the Congressional Black Caucus. I urge my colleagues to consider it and to support it.

Let me begin the debate by reemphasizing two very important points, the first of which is that the alternative budget of the Congressional Black Caucus stays within the established discretionary caps. Second, the deficit in the Congressional Black Caucus budget is \$1.6 billion less than the deficit proposed by the Committee on the Budget and \$2.6 billion less than the one put forth by President Clinton. So then in addition to being fiscally responsible, our budget aggressively addresses many of the problems facing our Nation today.

Mr. Chairman, we have a number of Members who want to speak and we have a limited amount of time. I am going to reserve my own remarks at this point in order that we might recognize some of the other Members.

First, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to our representative on the Committee on the Budget, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BLACKWELL].

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget.

This budget, entitled, "A Budget to Rescue America," underscores the urgency that confronts this Nation. This budget puts the priorities of America in proper order—it emphasizes jobs, putting people to work.

Mr. Chairman, policies of the past have left a trail of misery, stretching from the hills of West Virginia to the high-technology valleys of California. This trail of misery has left millions out of work or underemployed.

Many of these millions have been without a full-time, reasonably paying job for an extended period of time. The Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget addresses this pressing problem.

By investing at least \$2 billion more in job training and job creation than any other budget before us, the CBC alternative comes closest to meeting the mandate of the 1978 Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act.

This is a budget that rejects the view of the Federal Reserve Board that we must have unemployment to hold down inflation, and it embraces the pledge of the President of a lifetime of learning and earning for all.

This is a budget that ignores the debate over who can spend less, cut more, and get tougher, and recognizes that the best cure for America is to encourage growth, expand the economy, and create jobs.

This is a budget that understands that the earned income tax credit doesn't mean a thing to a person who is out of work. This budget gets tough on jobs, and if we do that, there will be less need to get tough on crime.

Unlike the proposed substitute budgets, this budget retains the Summer Jobs Program, includes a permanent extension of the targeted jobs tax cred-

it, and continues dislocated workers assistance.

The CBC alternative continues adult and youth job training programs, increases the School-to-Work Program and one-stop career centers, maintains the Job Corps, and funds the Empowerment Zone Program.

But, the CBC alternative goes beyond job training and job creation. This budget holds the line on such vital programs as public housing assistance, elderly housing, critical education programs, and AIDS research.

We continue the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program and Head Start, and we fund many aspects of the CBC crime bill, thus providing for Federal Government intervention in the effort to make our communities safe.

Most importantly, Mr. Chairman, the CBC alternative stays within discretionary spending caps, and provides additional money for deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the Defense budget was defended. At the same time, domestic programs are under attack. We are fighting over limited resources. We should be fighting to increase our resources.

We can increase resources by investing in human needs. The CBC alternative budget does that. If we hope to achieve real growth and prosperity for anyone, we must ensure that such growth and prosperity are benefits for everyone.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM].

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich budget, and I do so to talk about one particular area of that budget, and that is the welfare reform proposal contained in it which saves \$20 billion but which, much more importantly, does something real and substantial to help people who are in poverty get out of poverty. It gives people hope and opportunity, and it really focuses on putting incentives in the system and changing it from a system that is a permanent handout to a system that is a temporary hand-up.

□ 1050

The system as it is right now, if you look, is a system that is a long-term dependency system. The source of this chart is the cochairman of the President's task force on welfare reform, David Elwood.

Sixty-five percent of the people on welfare today will be on welfare for 8 or more years. That is not what the welfare system was created to do. It keeps people poor. If you are on welfare, you are poor. What we need to do is get people off of welfare into the mainstream of life, and that is exactly what the Kasich budget, what the welfare reform proposal contained in the Kasich budget does.

This is not a get-tough-on-welfare-recipients. This is give an opportunity to welfare recipients to get off welfare, to get back into the mainstream of economic life from our society.

There is another major problem with the welfare system. We talked about it yesterday in great detail. And that is the dramatic growth of the SSI program. Listen, there are a lot of people on SSI that need it. This is a needed program for many millions of disabled Americans who need some help to get through life. But this program is becoming so mismanaged and so blown out of control that it is actually doing a disservice to the people who need the help.

This is a program that has grown 30 percent over the last 3 years. We have gone from spending \$16 billion on this program to spending over \$23 billion a year on this program, because we have many millions more of non-citizens and children and drug addicts, which I talked about yesterday, who are getting on this program, who are sucking this money in, and are simply not the folks that we intended to help when we crafted this program. And it is an entitlement, so we simply just keep paying the money out, year after year after year, and no one in this chamber has done anything to try to reform this system. The Kasich budget does it.

Now, there are many Members on the other side of the aisle who say well, this is not the time to do welfare reform. This is not the time. We have to wait for the President's proposal. He has to come forward and do what he promised during the campaign, which was end welfare as we know it.

Well, we have been waiting 15 months to end welfare as we know it in this current administration, and still we have seen no bill introduced in Congress. But the other day, the President did send to some of us his outline of ending welfare as we know it. And I want to take the opportunity to go over this proposal and contrast it with what we are proposing in the welfare reform bill that we have in the Kasich budget.

The President proposes \$15 billion, not in savings, in the welfare bill. We have \$20 billion of savings in our bill. He proposes \$15 billion in new spending on welfare. And how does he spend this money?

Well, here is \$2 billion to bring more two-parent families into the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program. Another entitlement. Here is \$3 billion more for education and training. That is above the \$6 billion we already spend in the program. And here is \$8.4 billion on new day-care money. A total of \$13.5 billion in new spending.

Wait a minute here, there is some money for the work program. You know, the thing we were supposed to do to end welfare as we know it. Yes; \$820 million. The sum of \$14 in new spending

on extending welfare as we know it, \$1 in ending welfare as we know it.

Is this a joke? I mean, is this serious? I mean, this is supposed to be ending welfare as we know it.

By the way, there are no offsets to pay for any of this. This is just adding more money to the entitlement programs.

Let us get serious about welfare reform. Let us get serious about helping people, not just keeping people poor forever and ever. The Kasich budget is the opportunity to do that. It is an opportunity to say that we are concerned about the taxpayer who is funding this system.

The American people are generous. They want to help their fellow man. But they do not want to throw money into a system that is keeping people poor, is keeping them from hope and opportunity, and is trapping them in a system that simply does not work anymore.

Mr. Chairman, the chance is today. The Kasich budget has the reforms that are necessary to change America. Please support the Kasich budget.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, if you really want to understand what deficit reduction is all about, then what you should do is take a look at the amount of money that we are spending to keep people in jail, which reaches \$40 billion. Think about the cost of crime and violence. Think about the cost of AIDS and tuberculosis. Think about the cost of having kids dropping out of school, untrained and unemployed. And think about the lost competition, the lost productivity as a result of these Americans not being able to fulfill their potential. And take a look at where the labor market is going to be in the next 10 years.

I tell you, my colleagues, if you want to reduce the deficit, if you want to make this great Republic as responsible in providing the leadership that she can, if you want us to go into the next century being certain that we will be the leaders in trade, then you will have to make the proper investments today.

Mr. Chairman, you cannot really think you are balancing our Nation's budget by not providing for the health care that our families need, by not providing for those educations, and by making certain that every one of our youngsters that are born today will find it just as easy to get into college as this society has made it to get into jail; to be able to invest the same amount of moneys, if not more, in our teachers and in our schools and in our job training as some of these politically motivated bills would provide moneys just for more cops, more wardens, and more jails.

What the Congressional Black Caucus is saying is that yes, we come in and reduce the deficit in dollars and cents now, but more important than the dollars and cents is where we make that investment for America. And we make that investment in Americans that have been deprived of the opportunity of life, liberty, and that great pursuit of happiness.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich budget and in opposition to the Mfume budget. Mr. Chairman, I do so for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the way the two budgets, the two proposed budgets, treat defense spending.

Mr. Chairman, in 1990, then Secretary Richard Cheney came before the Committee on Armed Services, and he said the world is changing. The threat that our country faces is changing. We need less defense today than we needed yesterday, and we will need less tomorrow than we need today. He proposed that we reduce defense spending by some \$60 billion.

Mr. Chairman, we have started on that route where he said we were going to reduce defense, but do it right this time, he said, for the first time in history.

And then there was an election and we got a new President, and the \$60 billion reduction grew for a time to \$127 billion over the same period, and I understand and this year it has grown under the President's proposal to \$140 billion over the same relative period of time. This year's installment in the President's budget is \$14 billion in cuts.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would add \$9 billion in budget outlay to that \$14 billion, which in my opinion heads us exactly in the wrong direction.

I brought this chart to try to help clarify my position, and that is that this chart shows since 1939 how our defense dollars have been spent. The red line represents defense spending, national security spending. The blue line represents other domestic spending.

As you can see, during various conflicts, the amount, the level of spending, has gone up and down. But in a general sense, today we are about back where we were in terms of percentage of GNP as to where we were before World War II. And we all know that we have got to know that that is a very, very dangerous situation.

We use today these defense dollars for a number of purposes. We use it for peacekeeping, as we have been doing in Somalia. And as the majority leader pointed out yesterday, if we get some kind of an agreement in Bosnia, our forces will be called on to be peace-

keepers there presumably. And if we get an agreement, he said, in the Middle East, we will be called on to do peacekeeping there.

We do conflicts, like the one recently completed in the Middle East in Desert Shield and Desert Storm, and we have to be ready to do that. And Korea is an issue that we certainly cannot forget about. We use these dollars for humanitarian aid, both in the United States and abroad.

□ 1100

Under the Clinton proposal, we are discontinuing a number of programs, including the AFX, we are going to stop producing the F-16. We are going to stop producing the multirole fighter. We are going to stop our airlift, space lift projects. We are going to discontinue the SH60-B helicopter, and SH60-H helicopter, and we are buying no more armor in the foreseeable future.

Compared to 1985, our ship procurement is down 80 percent. Aircraft procurement is down 86 percent. Armor is down 100 percent. And strategic missiles are down 90 percent. We had a hollow force in the 1970's. We cannot have in this world today a repeat of the hollow force that we had in the 1970's.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE].

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget. There is a question that I am consistently asked. That is, how do we change our equations as it relates to the amount of money we spend for what many in this Nation call social programming.

Social programming, to many, is that investment, the moneys that we give in entitlement programs for the support of welfare, the support of health care, the support of our jails.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget treats this item differently. I think all of us in America need to change our attitude as it relates to what we call social. It is time for us to start thinking about investments. That is the reason in the Congressional Black Caucus budget, Members will find \$628 million made available for the President's Community Financial Bank Institution Development Program.

It is important for us to understand that many of the cities in this Nation could become very productive communities, if, in fact, we learned how to invest in them, as we do in most instances when there are opportunities for us not only to rebuild but to build the small job sector, to be able to build small businesses, to turn around those stores, those blocks of commercial strips that have been ignored for the most part for the last 25 or 30 years.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget understands that if we are real-

ly going to rebuild America, it is not the money that we put into jails that contributes to a burgeoning criminal justice enterprise, but rather, it is the money that we put into the communities, communities that we feel are opportunities, fields of opportunities that have long been ignored, opportunities that are available not only for the banking community, for corporate America, and for all who would come into those communities and begin to make those investments.

If we turn those communities around, they become places where franchises will be able to open up. They become places where banks will be able to bring new branches. They become places where young people who now stand idly by on street corners will have opportunities for jobs. If we give them jobs, we do not have to build the jails.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, although I support the Kasich alternative rather than the alternative offered by the gentleman from Maryland, I want to commend the gentleman from Maryland for drafting a budget which not only reflects their priorities but which also shows how they would pay for them.

That is exactly what the Republican Kasich alternative does as well. Unfortunately, that is not what the President did in his budget, and that is not what we find in the committee's resolution.

The Republican alternative includes welfare reform. It includes a tough anticrime bill. It includes reasonable health care reforms. It includes incentives to generate job-creating economic growth. It also eliminates one-third of last year's tax increase and returns the money to families through a \$500 per child tax credit.

The Republican alternative does all this, pays for it, and yet results in an additional \$152 billion more in deficit reduction during the next 5 years than the President's budget.

The budget crafted by the Democratic majority does not stand up in comparison with either our alternative or the alternative offered by the gentleman from Maryland because it does not contain funding for many items the President has said are his priorities.

For example, the President has said he is committed to health care reform, but it is not in his budget. The President has said he is for welfare reform, but he has not budgeted for it. In the 1992 campaign, the President said he favored a middle-class tax cut, but the only one available this year is contained in the Republican Kasich budget.

I urge my colleagues to support the Kasich alternative.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the CBC.

I am very pleased to join with the members of the CBC and other Members of the House in supporting the budget that best represents the way in which the resources of this country ought to be spent. We are in a range of deficit neutrality on the various plans. They are all very close.

The question then is, within that range, how best do we spend the money?

The Congressional Black Caucus budget comes closer than any other to dealing with the most significant problems America faces today. We are still in a period of cultural lag. We are still in a period in which we are focused on an external danger, even though it has greatly diminished.

That is an understandable cultural lag. From at least 1940 until almost 1990, for a period of about 50 years, this country was, in fact, threatened by outside forces that had no respect for basic human values and sufficient power to destroy our way of life. There is no question. First the Nazis and then the Communists.

Therefore, for 50 years, the single greatest focus of American policy at the national level was national defense. One need not agree with everything done in the name of national defense at that point to have denied that.

Now, however, we are in a qualitatively different world. Yes, there are nations in this world that do not share our values, that do not act responsibly. But there is a qualitative difference. None of them individually, all of them together do not have the kind of power that existed in the coalition under Hitler or the coalition under Stalin and his successors.

The survival of the United States as a free and open society is no longer at risk from outside. But our budgetary allocation does not reflect that. Our major problems are today at home: the loss of millions of young people to a life that brings pain to them and loss and danger to others, environmental problems, inadequate health for people, older people who continue to face their retirement years in deprivation, people with illness who cannot get adequate treatment.

We have, in every other budget, and I must say this is true of the Budget Committee's budget as well, I voted for it and if it is the best we can do, I will vote for it again. But every other budget except the CBC budget continues to reflect that mistaken cultural view that says our survival is at risk from outside and to meet that nonexistent threat to our survival from outside diminishes the resources available to

deal with the problems of poverty, of poor education, of inadequate health, of the loneliness of age, of environmental disaster.

The Black Caucus budget will not solve all of those problems, but it comes closer than any other to putting our resources where they are most needed.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN].

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Kasich substitute. Although the President has proposed a sound budget and we are discussing an important option though from CBC. The Kasich substitute goes further to cut wasteful spending and to reduce the deficit while also providing the overburdened middle class with an income tax cut.

My constituents want a fiscally responsible agenda which includes a comprehensive anticrime strategy, along with welfare reform and health care reform plans—the Kasich substitute delivers.

My constituents want an often promised and long-awaited middle-class tax cut. A \$500 per child tax credit for parents which amounts to a \$60 million per district tax credit for families—the Kasich substitute delivers.

My constituents want cuts in wasteful and unnecessary Government spending, a 50-percent cut in House mailing privileges, and a 25-percent cut in the congressional budget—the Kasich substitute delivers.

My constituents want lower deficits in each of the next 5 years totaling about \$278 billion over the same 5-year period in net deficit reductions—over \$152 billion more than that promised by the administration—the Kasich substitute delivers.

My constituents want the elimination of wasteful pork-barrel programs such as the federally subsidized honey program and the Alaska Power Administration—the Kasich substitute delivers.

Mr. Chairman, I support the only plan which offers a clear agenda to fight crime, reforms our health care system, and reforms our welfare system without spending a single additional Federal dollar. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Kasich substitute—the budget that delivers for the American people.

□ 1110

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget. This is the most moderate budget we have ever submitted.

However, we do take small steps in the right direction. We take steps in

the direction of providing more funds for education and more funds for jobs, job training and retraining, and we also take steps to deal with the construction of schools and a few other badly needed facilities.

It is important to note, Mr. Chairman, that people who talk about welfare reform should understand that the welfare reform problem is easily solved by providing for more education and more job opportunities. We cannot solve the problem of the subsidies, we cannot deal with the welfare kings, the people who were given \$11.5 billion by the Department of Agriculture in the last 5 years. Yes, taxpayers, listen, \$11.5 billion in loan forgiveness is forgiven to the millionaire farmers of the West and the Midwest over the last 5 years. That welfare reform we cannot deal with. We will have to deal with it some other way. But we can deal with the welfare reform of mothers with children who need help. If they are given jobs, job opportunities and job training opportunities, we can solve that problem.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget is a budget which emphasizes more money for jobs, job training, and more money for education. This is an alternative which carries America in the right direction. We do not need billions of dollars more for defense, we need billions of dollars in order to rebuild our infrastructure and to deal with the human engineering problems that we have to deal with, the problems of job opportunities and education.

This is the best budget that does that. This is the alternative that American taxpayers can support and know that there is a minimum of waste here. No more money for welfare kings in this budget, no more \$11.5 billion in giveaways in this budget. We will stop the welfare.

If we stop the welfare kings we are sure we can solve the problem of welfare in our cities by providing more jobs and more education for the people who are on welfare.

This is a budget for all of the people.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING].

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, a little common sense in our Federal budget process might really go a long way. I know our constituents back home would approve.

For the last 2 days we have been debating the nonbinding budget resolution. It is a blueprint though for our spending for the next year. After all of the rhetoric and the smoke has cleared, the majority party will pass their budget. I guess the spending buck and the deficit buck stops there.

Under the majority plan, the deficit will go down. That is good news. But the bad news is that we are still going to have a daily deficit of a half a bil-

lion dollars. I guess we only go broke a little slower.

Common sense would tell us that we have not done enough. We would be critical of the average American family in Bloomington, IL if they handled their budget this way. And we have an alternative.

I encourage my colleagues to consider the Kasich budget. We save more money, \$152 billion. We put money in there for welfare reform, for health care reform, for immigration reform.

It is just so simple, just common sense. It is time that we addressed the need to cut spending. Do it now and bring our budget in balance.

The Kasich budget has enough pain in it for all of us. But it is good. It is on the right track. Let us do it now. It is common sense.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding the time. I know the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] wanted to enter into a colloquy.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I understand under the budget of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the Republican initiative, that he assumes that there is going to be a 50-percent reduction in the special tax preference for ethanol, is that correct?

Mr. KASICH. The gentleman from Illinois is correct.

Mr. EWING. Is the gentleman aware that there are those of us who believe this provision, if enacted, would in fact increase spending on farm commodity programs rather than reduce spending that the gentleman sought in his budget?

Mr. KASICH. I have been made aware of that fact, that that is the opinion of the gentleman and others like him.

Mr. EWING. Is it now the gentleman's intent to eliminate the provision in conference on the budget resolution?

Mr. KASICH. The gentleman is again correct. I intend to support the gentleman's efforts and those of other Members who believe this preference is essential and will remove the policy from the assumption on this initiative.

Mr. EWING. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his assistance.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the alternative presented to the House by the Congressional Black Caucus.

We have heard a lot about families in this debate. Clearly, the families in this country are the strength of this country.

If we are truly concerned about easing the burden on our families, we should defeat the budget offered by the Congressional Black Caucus, and pass the Kasich alternative.

Here are the broad strokes of the Kasich budget: First, it reexamines the role of the Federal Government; second, it includes full funding for welfare reform, a downpayment on health care reform and funding for improved crime control; and third, the Kasich budget actually accomplishes what the President promised last year, and then never delivered: deficit reduction, and a tax break for families.

You do not have to serve in Congress to know that you do not reduce Government spending by giving the Federal Government more money to spend.

To truly reinvent government you must examine the role of government and decide definitely what it should and should not do.

The Kasich budget accomplishes this: It eliminates the Interstate Commerce Commission, a Behemoth bureaucracy that has outlived its usefulness; repeals the Davis-Bacon requirements reducing the outlays by making Federal contracting more competitive; and privatizes air traffic control operations.

I find it interesting and a sign of the intellectual strength of our party that the Kasich budget incorporates some of the best Republican proposals to deal with this country's toughest issues.

Finally, the Kasich alternative provides families with a \$500-per-child tax credit for middle-income families. This will ultimately scale back the heavy tax burden President Clinton placed on families last year.

All of this can be accomplished while still reducing our enormous Federal deficit. Kasich's budget cuts the deficit by \$162 billion next year, and approximately \$310 billion over 5 years.

The Republican alternative, presented by Mr. KASICH and the Republican members of the Budget Committee, is a win-win proposition.

Win-win means less spending by the Federal Government, and lower taxes for the families of America.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER].

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the alternative budget offered by the Congressional Black Caucus. Over the years the CBC alternative budget has been characterized as a tax-and-spend budget.

Mr. Chairman, this time, those who have opposed us in the past, can now step up to the plate and support this budget. Why? Because this budget first, stays within established discretionary

caps; second, spends \$1.8 billion less than the House Budget Committee; and third, commits \$2.6 billion more to deficit reduction than the President's budget.

Mr. Chairman, this is the only budget being considered that finally and most importantly, is designed to rescue America.

The American people have made it very clear: What they want is an investment in jobs, an investment in infrastructure, and an investment in children. This budget does just that. It includes a \$98 million increase in spending to the Community Development Block Grant Program, it establishes community development banks to help spur economic investment and opportunities in areas that so desperately need them. This budget contains a \$500 million increase in Community Development Block Programs targeted specifically to meet economic conversion planning needs.

Mr. Chairman, this budget speaks of our commitment to the future of this country, our children. It says to our children, we care. We provide for additional funding for training programs and after school recreational programs. When are we going to learn? Supporting our families is more than just providing a \$500 tax break per child. We must have a comprehensive strategy to save our families and, indeed, entire communities.

This budget funds many of the excellent proposals contained in the CBC alternative crime bill, to combat the ongoing violence found in far too many cities and towns throughout this country. This budget, Mr. Chairman, keeps our commitment to international responsibilities, and builds on expanded burden sharing with our allies, in meeting the challenge of global security. This budget takes advantage of the new geopolitical realities, the increases in requests for global peacekeeping activity, and new modifications to projected drawdowns on this account.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come for us to make the American people a priority. Let us pass a budget that invests in our future, our children's future and rescues America. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to vote for the CBC alternative budget.

□ 1120

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, one of the most fraudulent budget practices of Congress is being exposed today.

In the Kasich budget, Republicans adopted legislation introduced by Representative COX and me, to eliminate the so-called current services budget baseline. Later, the committee incorporated a similar provision into its budget.

That is progress. For the first time, Congress has admitted that baseline budgeting is deceptive and should go.

We all know the game. Under the present system, Congress builds an automatic increase into each Government spending program every year by adding the rate on inflation, population growth and various technical factors.

Any time a spending increase does not reach the new baseline, it is called a cut by the politicians in Washington.

As Lee Iacocca said recently, "If we did that in business, they would lock us up."

Congress uses this accounting deception to claim it is cutting a specific program while actually increasing spending. It is time for the deception to end and to run the Federal Government like a business.

Mr. Chairman, today's action is a positive first step. I thank the 122 sponsors of my bill, from both sides of the aisle, for their support. Now, let us get rid of baseline budgeting once and for all.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the alternative budget offered by Congressman MFUME on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus, in coalition with the congressional progressive caucus.

Mr. Chairman, this alternative budget is not about outlays. Instead, Mr. MFUME and his colleagues are presenting us with a blueprint for the safest and wisest investment in this country today—an investment in our people.

First, this budget allows an additional \$2 billion in funds for job training and job creation. We must make this additional investment and make it now. We have been losing the moderate- and high-paying jobs that once allowed many workers in this country to lift themselves and their families up to a better life. Many are being replaced by low-wage, low-benefit, no-future employment.

This alternative budget provides additional resources to give our people the skills and training they need to contribute to, and benefit from the economy of the future.

Second, the Congressional Black Caucus' substitute allows additional investments in the education of our children. It would raise the number of disadvantaged students served by compensatory education programs, fund improvements in elementary and secondary schools facilities, and raise the maximum Pell grant awards for low-income college students.

Mr. Chairman, our children are our future. More dollars for education means a brighter tomorrow for the Nation.

Last, the alternative budget makes an investment in the health of our Na-

tion. It provides an additional \$1.4 billion for health care in the next fiscal year. By adding these resources now, we recover a healthier and more productive work force and Nation tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman, it is time that we redirect billions of dollars wasted on arms, and invest in job training, in education, and in health care. I urge strong support for this progressive, enlightened budget proposal.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich budget and in opposition to the Clinton budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the budget resolution before us today. In large respect, it replicates the administration's budget for veterans. It is the first real Clinton budget for veterans and there are no two ways about it. It is an outrage and travesty for veterans and the VA.

The Budget Committee has not improved on the President's request. Both the President's and the Democrat's budget plans are dead wrong. Their implication, of course, is that veterans are better served by cutting back on spending for veterans' programs. It hasn't happened in the past and don't expect it in the future.

I know my colleagues want to know if we are doing as much as we can for veterans. We are not. This budget is short in nearly every category. It is severely lacking in resources necessary to make the VA health care system competitive with the private sector under the Clinton Health Security Act.

It undermines all claims to maintaining a separate independent system which could credibly be expected to compete for veteran patients.

The almost cavalier attitude toward making any significant progress on the claims processing backlog invites future litigation for denial of due process.

On the medical care side, it's a blueprint for health care decline. The budget doesn't keep pace with costs. It claims a \$500 million increase in health care funding, yet VA's own conservative estimate of what it needs to produce a current services level is \$611 million.

The budget claims that VA can compete and survive in national health reform, yet this budget expects VA to treat 27,000 more veterans with 3,680 fewer employees and less than current services dollars.

Instead of demonstrating a commitment to upgrading VA health care, this budget shamelessly holds eight ambulatory care projects hostage to passage of the Clinton Health Security Act.

If we are going to keep faith with veterans, the programs serving veterans require increases. I am not satisfied with a system where veterans must wait months to see a doctor, can't get an answer on a phone call, or are unable to begin rehabilitation for service-connected disability.

Our veterans deserve better.

I am disappointed that this budget overlooks every item, except research, that the Veterans

Affairs Committee identified on a bipartisan basis as shortcomings of this budget.

This budget rejects the Veterans' Affairs Committee's bipartisan request for additions that would move us toward restoring current services and toward correcting the critical backlog in medical equipment that now stands at nearly \$1 billion.

On the benefit side, this budget rejects bipartisan proposals to maintain services that would otherwise fall victim to further erosion. VA programs already face an administrative nightmare by any standard or definition. We cannot allow this situation to slip further.

In striking contrast to the needs which VA faces in fiscal year 1995 and beyond, the administration requested a level of funding substantially below what is needed to maintain current services to veterans. At the same time, the Veterans Health Administration will be required to absorb an unprecedented reduction in total employment as part of a government-wide employee reduction.

The combination of employee reductions and diminished medical care funding will require VA to cut services or delay provision of services at the very time efforts should be made to expand services and improve their quality.

The Veterans' Committee knows full well that at many facilities the lack of a primary care mechanism results in unacceptable waiting lines for veterans.

This budget rejects the Committee on Veterans' Affairs recommendation, as a high priority, the addition of funding toward fuller development of a primary care capacity within VA facilities.

This budget would simply maintain a situation that requires veterans to wait—to wait for examination, to wait for treatment, and to wait for appointments to specialty clinics.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs identified the longstanding budgetary failure to address adequately the physical condition of VA facilities. As a result of this deficiency, VA health care facilities need to replace aging medical equipment and carry out basic maintenance and repair that presently go unmet.

For fiscal 1995, this budget provides no money to meet the needed replacement medical equipment backlog of more than \$700 million, or the unmet repair and maintenance work estimated at nearly \$930 million. The veteran service organizations identify funding to eliminate the medical backlog as one of VA's most critical needs and point to the repair backlog as endangering patient safety and quality of care as well as leading to the unseemly public opinion of VA facilities.

The VA has long led the way in post traumatic stress disorder treatment and research, and specialized PTSD treatment teams are located at VA facilities throughout the country. The number of veterans suffering from PTSD is difficult to determine, but, in fiscal 1992, studies indicate PTSD was the fifth most frequent primary diagnosis in VA hospitals.

A comprehensive study of the effectiveness of VA's special PTSD outpatient programs found that veterans treated in these programs demonstrated significant improvements in symptoms, legal difficulties, rate of employment, and outward violence.

The Veterans' Affairs Committee highlighted the need to modestly expand these programs

with an additional \$2 million and 50 additional employees to help establish an additional 30 access points for these programs. The budget gives this area no priority and provides no additional funding.

The administration's request for major construction funding, like the medical care budget, falls dramatically below prior year levels and altogether fails to address the broad system needs. In seeking only \$115 million in new budget authority for fiscal 1995, the administration is requesting \$262 million less than was appropriated last year and \$465 million less than in fiscal year 1991.

This dramatically diminished commitment to construction does not appear to be a one-time phenomenon, with outyear budgets averaging only \$175 million annually.

Though it is clear that uncertainty surrounding national health care reform adds complexity to construction planning, the need that prompted the Congress last year to call for giving greater priority in the construction planning process for ambulatory care and nursing home care have not changed. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs, therefore, believes that the Department's request to the Office of Management and Budget of \$377 million in major construction for fiscal year 1995 is a far sounder target, though still inadequate, than the \$115 million proposed to Congress in this document.

The Veterans Benefits Administration faces a serious administrative crisis of a growing backlog of claims and a steady delay in the timely processing of veterans' claims.

In fiscal year 1993 some 4,357 employees were provided for VBA adjudication activity and 3.4 million claims actions were received and completed, leaving a backlog of 531,078 claims. The pending backlog is projected to increase in fiscal year 1994 to approximately 700,000 claims, and in fiscal year 1995, to nearly 900,000 claims.

At the end of fiscal year 1993, the average elapsed time between receipt and completion of an original compensation claim was 189 days, compared to VA's goal of 106 days. The average elapsed time is expected to increase to 235 days in fiscal year 1995.

Statistics demonstrate that the backlog of claims is fast becoming unmanageable and that timeliness of claims has slipped significantly. Moreover, the quality of work has deteriorated. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs believes that unless a significant number of additional employees are provided and drastic action is taken to modify existing procedures, the entire process will only fall further behind.

This budget produces no sign of future improvement in this serious situation. The budget leaves service-connected claims by veterans to the whimsy of chance. By choice the budget requests a Veterans Benefits Administration decrease of 622 employees. Yet VA officials say they are being overwhelmed by claims.

Nationally, the VA benefit claims backlog was 377,000 4 years ago, but by the end of September it could reach 870,000.

How can a 622 employee reduction in the Veterans Benefits Administration be justified in light of the worsening trend away from the Department's timeliness goals on compensation and pension? From fiscal 1994 to fiscal 1995,

timeliness would slip from 226 average days for completing a claim to 235 days, when the goal is 106 days. This budget will only serve to let this situation slip out of control.

For the Board of Veterans Appeals, the veterans wait to get a decision can be more than 2 years. But VA officials report that the processing time could be 2,500 days by the end of fiscal 1995. That's nearly 7 years.

This budget does nothing to address this situation, other than to maintain the current structure, leading to delays that would be measured in years rather than days. The Veterans' Affairs Committee saw fit to add \$4 million and 50 additional employees to work this backlog down, but this budget rejects any feasible approach to this problem.

Mr. Chairman, we must begin to process claims for benefits on a more timely basis. It takes far too much time to process compensation, pension, and education claims.

Under the Vocational Rehabilitation and Counseling Program, VA provides rehabilitation and counseling services for eligible veterans, service members and their dependents. VR&C's primary mission is to provide all services and assistance necessary to enable service-connected disabled veterans to achieve maximum independence in daily living and, to the maximum extent, to become employable and to obtain and maintain suitable employment.

VR&C continues to experience a significant increase in applications for benefits and vocational counseling. The increase is in part due to the downsizing of the military.

Despite the fact that VR&C staff have been unable to keep pace with the rapidly growing workload, this budget would contemplate a reduction of 19 field staff to handle a projected increase of 3,700 cases in fiscal year 1995. With workload target and timeliness standards currently failing, how does fewer staff achieve the rehabilitation goals of this program for service-connected service members?

The President recommends and this budget accepts a reduced funding level for the Veterans Service Program. The present staff in this program operates through VA's 58 regional offices and satellite facilities. VA's estimate of 11.1 million public assistance contacts in fiscal year 1994 has already been exceeded in barely 6 months.

Data from traffic studies of VA's 800-service lines indicate that the average blocked call rate, in fiscal 1993, was an astounding 62 percent. These studies reveal that because of inadequate staffing of telephone service a significant number of veterans seeking information and assistance are not receiving the service to which they are entitled.

The uncertain economic times and the continued downsizing of the armed services continues to generate increased requests for information and assistance. Additionally, issues which receive wide press coverage, such as reports of radiation testing during the 1940's, 1950's, and 1960's and concerns related to possible illnesses related to service in the Persian Gulf, result in increased telephone calls. Without adequate staffing and budget resources in fiscal year 1995, the VA staff cannot meet the assistance needs of veterans and their dependents.

In the National Cemetery System, VA received the remains of over 70,000 veterans in

the last fiscal year. In fiscal year 1995, VA estimates 73,000 interments. With available funding in fiscal year 1994, the backlog of essential operating equipment to keep pace with timely burial will increase to \$6.7 million and VA projects an additional \$2.7 million in equipment will be due for replacement in 1995. This budget provides inadequate funding to reduce the backlog of replacement equipment. With funding of \$1.6 million. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs recommended the addition of \$7.8 million to meet this obvious need.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation has no greater obligation than to care for its veterans. Over the years, Congress has made commitments to veterans that a grateful Nation supports. This resolution backs out of those commitments and fails to meet our obligations. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN].

Mr. CALLAHAN. Gentlemen of the House, I rise in total opposition to the Black Caucus budget resolution and in total support of the Kasich resolution. I also rise in opposition to the Budget Committee resolution and tell you that through experiences I have had within the last 60 days in my district I had the opportunity to hold town meetings throughout all of my six counties.

The one common thread of complaint that I heard was that the people of Alabama and the people of America are sick and tired of the Government growing at the pace it is growing. They are tired of the Federal Government telling us what time of day we are going to get up, tired of all of these new programs that tell us how much money we are going to earn, how much we are going to keep. They are tired of big government, and the message they gave to me was, yes, do something about health care; yes, do something about crime.

But the strongest message was do something about the growth of that Government; stop this wasteful spending; stop these new programs. That is precisely what the Kasich bill does. It starts us on the road toward these reductions in diametric opposition to what the Mfume bill does and the budget resolution does, because he is growing big Government.

In addition to that, the Black Caucus budget reduces the national defense to the point that we might not even have enough money for one platoon, \$175 billion less than the Budget Committee requested.

So what Kasich does is give us as much money as we can possibly afford to ensure we have a strong national defense, cuts back on the size of Government, and works toward what all of us are going back and telling our people in our respective districts: We are sick and tired of Government, too, being so large, and we seriously want to do something about this deficit and this growing debt of the American Government.

The only way we have to do that today is to vote down the Black Caucus budget and to vote for the Kasich substitute.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in point of fact, if I might, the Congressional Black Caucus' budget deficit, as proposed in the bill, is \$1.8 billion less than the deficit proposed by the Committee on the Budget and \$2.6 billion less than the one put forth by the administration.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Black Caucus budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the CBC's budget resolution. As a member of the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Development, I want to speak specifically about this budget's effect on community growth.

Last year, we made some tough choices in order to cut the Federal deficit and redirect our resources to invest in our people. And while we are starting to see the positive effects of these choices in the cities and towns in my district, the scars of the recent recession are still fresh there as well. Now is the time to redouble our efforts to ensure that all of our citizens gain from the recent recovery, including the people in the inner cities who suffered so greatly under the policies of the 1980's.

The CBC budget recognizes the magnitude of the need for investment in our communities. It increases funding for community and regional development by about \$530 million over the President's request. It provides increased funds for the Community Development Block Grant Program. And it adds \$750 million for the Neighborhood Infrastructure Improvement and Inner City Jobs Creation Act, which funds job creation for people in poor communities who are out of work or lack basic skills.

The CBC budget is a fiscally responsible approach to investing in our people and our communities. I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting it.

□ 1130

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget and urge my colleagues to support this sound economic alternative.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I recommended changes in our international funding priorities, which are reflected in this budget alternative.

In view of the shifting political landscape around the globe, it makes good economic sense to reassess the allocation of our foreign aid dollars to be sure we are using our resources as effectively as possible.

Newly emerging democracies should be encouraged as we move toward the

establishment of formal bilateral relationships.

The United States has been generous in our support of the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union. Unfortunately, funds for this purpose have been diverted from developing country accounts.

I want to point out that the cold war took its costliest toll on the continent of Africa when the United States supported former dictatorships at the expense of the African people. I believe that restitution is necessary to begin to bring an end to the suffering now caused by civil wars and resulting ethnic tensions.

As Americans and advocates of freedom, let us support the emerging democracies on the continent of Africa with the same enthusiasm and commitment of resources with which we have endowed the new European democracies. With the release of Nelson Mandela and the imminent elections in South Africa, the United States has a historic opportunity to bring freedom to an era where oppression has long been the status quo.

Our budget proposes restoration of an earmark for the Development Fund for Africa at \$1.2 billion. We support the creation of a Southern Africa Enterprise Fund at \$100 million, similar to those in Eastern Europe. In addition, we call for the restoration of cuts in Public Law 480, title 2—the food and work program—and title 3—direct food assistance—by \$158 million.

Other objectives of our budget include improved United States financial participation in U.N. peacekeeping activities, pursuing equitable trade relations with Africa and the Caribbean and monitoring the impact of special trade agreements within the hemisphere, as well as with Asia, Latin America, and Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that we have pressing domestic problems—problems crying out a solution.

Some critics of foreign aid say that we should not spend a penny overseas until our domestic affairs are in order. The reality is that in today's interdependent world, there is a strong link between our ability to succeed at home and our ability to build international relationships.

I urge my colleagues to help us build a better country and a better world by supporting the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, some in this Chamber know I have major concerns about how we approach the budget. My own solution would be to convene a special session of the Congress to have us, without the Committee on Rules' intervention, vote these issues up or down by

majority vote. Our hands are tied in terms of constructive proposals simply because we are faced with four choices which contain a hodgepodge of recommendations, often more ideological than rational.

I favor most of what my colleagues have put in on the Republican side. But there has been one major error, and I want to address my remarks solely to that. That is the repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act.

I can think of nothing that would undercut the working people of this country more than the repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Mr. Chairman, James Davis was the Secretary of Labor under three Republican Presidents: Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. In 1931, as a Republican Senator from Pennsylvania, he joined with Robert Bacon, a Republican Member of the House from New York, and together they authored and led through Congress, President Hoover's request for this historic legislation, which has been on the books for over six decades.

What the Davis-Bacon Act provides is that construction, alteration, and repair, which is funded with Federal money shall meet the prevailing wages in the locality of the projects for similar crafts and skills on comparable construction work.

Why did they do this? Because in the midst of the Depression, when millions of our citizens were out of work and there was great misery, often fly-by-night contractors would come with pickup untrained labor and bid on contracts with low-wage workers and thus undercut the workers and contractors in a local labor market.

That Davis-Bacon law is on the books and should remain on the books, for good reason. The contractors in a locality who bid on these projects with workers who are paid the prevailing wage—the carpenters, the electricians, the operating engineers, the laborers, the plumbers, and many others in their important crafts—generally continue to live in that community. We should not do anything to undercut what our neighbors, the construction working people of America, have achieved, both men and women, in terms of the prevailing wage.

Only three Presidents have created exceptions to this law. Those were shortlived—in a few weeks in the case of Franklin D. Roosevelt and Richard M. Nixon, a longer period but limited to the areas in the three States affected by the hurricanes which struck parts of Florida, Louisiana, and Hawaii in the fall of 1992. This Congress should not create any exceptions to the Davis-Bacon Act. I include as part of my remarks, "The Purpose of the Act" as described by William G. Whittaker, Specialist, Economics Division, Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress:

PURPOSE OF THE ACT

In the late 1920s, the Federal Government undertook a major program of public building which, as the Nation moved into the depression after 1929, had important implications for the areas where the work was to be performed. Such contracts were normally awarded to the lowest bidder. Certain itinerant contractors, through the employment of non-union workers from low-wage parts of the country, were able (or were believed to be able) to underbid local contractors for such projects. Thus, the employment impact of public construction on localities was reduced, distressing both local contractors and their workers.

The Davis-Bacon Act was fashioned to protect "fair" local contractors and workers, residing in and employed in local markets, from "unfair" competition by low-wage (often itinerant) contractors. Further, it was intended to help assure quality of construction, to help stabilize the local economy and industry, and to make the Federal Government, indirectly through its power as a consumer, a model for private sector employers in the area of labor standards.

When drafting the Davis-Bacon Act, Congress was not searching for the cheapest labor for Federal construction work. Instead, it was concerned with preserving "fair" labor standards and the stability of local markets. Some may argue, however, that there is no essential conflict between the purposes of the original enactment and securing a bargain for the public agency consumer. Employment of skilled labor at a "fair" wage (which Congress has determined to be the locally prevailing wage for the craft), may result in economy in the long term: better work, more quickly performed, and less costly to maintain.

CONSISTENT CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT

Since 1931, Congress has consistently broadened and strengthened Davis-Bacon. In 1934, it added the Copeland "anti-kickback" provisions to insure compliance with the prevailing wage requirements of Davis-Bacon. In 1935, Congress reduced the dollar volume threshold for triggering the Act from the original \$5,000 to \$2,000—to prevent fragmentation of contracts in order to circumvent the statute. In the 1950s, Congress began to add Davis-Bacon provisions to various program statutes in which, while the Federal Government might not be the direct contractor, Federal funding would make the work possible.

[From William G. Whittaker, "The Davis-Bacon Act: Action During the 103rd Congress," page CRS-2]

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I thank the caucus for doing a wonderful job once again.

This is the budget with vision. We either believe in equality and justice for all or we do not. This is the budget that gives a hand up to people.

Let me talk about what a lot of perceptions about this budget are that are wrong. A lot of people have the perception that the Black Caucus budget is about handouts, it is about training for no jobs that are there, and so on. Let me answer what this budget has in it.

It has some very, very good job creation, better than anything else. They

increase science and space. And they put extra money in for creating jobs in things like high-definition television and many other places that are the jobs of the future.

In energy, they increase energy. And guess what they do? They transfer money from nuclear fission to alternative fuels for creating new kinds of automobiles and so forth.

We have heard all sorts of people talk on this floor, talking about, If you vote for this budget, we won't be able to afford but one platoon in the military. Oh, yeah? Does one platoon cost \$260 billion, then you get all the rest of it for the additional \$10 billion that the Black Caucus passed?

Now that does not pass the giggle test. But that is what it is.

If you really believe that—and it is very sad that we do not have truth-in-advertising that we have for selling toothpaste in the same thing for selling the budget—but if you listen to people saying, "If you vote for this, defense is over, America will be overrun," they only cut \$10 billion out of \$270 billion. That is one-twenty seventh or 16.8. It barely shows up.

Now let me tell you something: I have been ahead of burden sharing for ever and ever and ever. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] has shown all sorts of money overseas. You can save this money by burden sharing.

Yesterday on the floor I read 12 different tractor programs in research and development. No one stood up to defend any of them. I said you could take all of those out. I went on about how you consolidate the chaplains' schools and the engineering schools and all sorts of things. You can do all sorts of things which save money.

□ 1140

But let us stop just saying, "If you vote for this, you will decimate defense," because that will not happen at all. This is talking about base closings overseas where it is most expensive to do it. Leave the bases at home. Train at home. Be flexible at home. And do things like the Colorado National Guard is doing now, serving the homeless at home. That is what this budget is about.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] for yielding this time to me, but I say to the gentleman from California who just yielded that he may be disappointed in yielding to me because I am inclined to support the Black Caucus budget because the Black Caucus budget is the only one that has a forward look about it on the funding for

NIH, the National Institutes of Health. Why do I say that?

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] to pay close attention to what I am saying because I may engage him in a dialog on this.

If my understanding is correct, Mr. Chairman, the budget that is presented by the Black Caucus maintains the President's proposals for funding for NIH but then allows a flexibility therein to do expansion of that budget for some inflationary or other purposes.

Is that correct?

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct in that assumption.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, on that basis I am going to try to persuade myself to back the Black Caucus budget on that point alone. Every other budget that has been presented cuts back either actually, or potentially, or in the future on the funding for NIH.

What are we doing? In a day and an hour when we are arguing about health care and about funding for our health care needs in this country, Mr. Chairman, we are cutting back on something that adds to the preventative care mode of our health care system and which can cut costs in the future. On that basis alone I am persuading myself to support the Black Caucus budget.

Another point that has to be made here, Mr. Chairman:

In cutting back on research, in rationing the power of Dr. Varma who is the head of the NIH, rationing his power, forcing him to ration the allocations to researchers, we are rationing future cures for our Nation and its citizens, and it seems to me that, if the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] were here with me, he would be helping me with my argument here because we are being penny-wise and pound-foolish.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] has expired.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, could I ask for an extra minute?

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I will not be able to yield an extra minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GEKAS. Now I am more than ever persuaded to vote for the Black Caucus budget.

Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] yield?

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I can yield 30 seconds to the gentleman who is undergoing transformation.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from Maryland, "No, you are because you recognize the importance of NIH, and that's important."

What I intend to do is to pursue a policy that we have begun to expand

the virtues of NIH. The Medical Research Caucus of the Congress has had 25 separate sessions on why we should be supporting increases in NIH for the purpose of health care reform in our country.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today, not in support of the amendment, the substitute offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME], but to say that it is an intellectually honest one and it is a good faith effort. It is one that clearly deserves to be debated because of the effort that it makes here today. But the primary reason that I would oppose it is because of the cuts it makes in the budget.

Mr. Chairman, despite what the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] said, the \$175 billion additional cut below the baseline of the Clinton plan, and that is on top of the cuts that the Clinton plan would make, would be devastating to national defense.

Well, is there an alternative to the Clinton budget? Yes, there is. There is one that will be debated next, and it is that plan that is offered by the Republicans on the Committee on the Budget led by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. Chairman, there are four points that I would make about this alternative:

First, it has \$150 billion deeper cuts than the Clinton budget does in actual spending; second, it changes the way that government does business, by returning a lot of the responsibilities of government to where it should be, to local and to State governments, and we do that through block grants of programs that will enable us to have the same services, but provided by the States without the overhead of the Federal and State governments for each of the separate programs; and third, it fully and honestly accounts for the actual costs of programs in health care, the welfare reform, and the crime initiative, all of which are strikingly absent from the Clinton plan; and of course last, it has a \$500 per child tax credit.

A lot of groups have supported this in large measure, Mr. Chairman, because of the tax credit that is in there for children and for American families. Let me just read to my colleagues a few of the organizations:

Citizens Against Government Waste.
Concerned Women for America.
The Association of Concerned Taxpayers.
The Family Research Council.
The National Taxpayers Union.
Americans for Tax Reform.
The Associated Builders and Contractors.
The Financial Executives Institute.

The Small Business Survival Committee.

The Eagle Forum.

The Institute for Research on the Economics of Taxation.

Mr. Chairman, these are groups which have looked at this tax credit and understand the reasons for it.

Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is this:

Do we have a budget to give Washington more of our money for paper and paper clips, or should we leave the money with our constituents and their families? I think it should be the latter.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering a number of budget substitutes. The CBC budget builds on the foundation of economic growth we have seen over the last year. Yet of all the measures we are considering today, only the CBC budget makes the necessary investments to continue that trend, and to give our children the chance to grow up in safe neighborhoods, be educated in world class schools, and to create the type of high-skilled, high-paid jobs that will give them a chance at a bright future.

How can we doom the hope of these children? My distinguished colleague from Ohio wants to give a \$500 tax credit for families, which sounds like a wonderful idea.

But then he turns around, hits kids, elderly, the poor, and unrepresented right between the eyes.

My dear colleague, and some of his friends on the other side of the aisle, propose to take away money from schools, over \$15.5 billion from education alone. He hits the elderly and poor by cutting \$10 billion from Medicare. Then he hits the poor again, by eliminating the entire legal services program.

The CBC budget cuts the deficit but maintains compassion. I urge my colleagues to look closely at the CBC alternative budget—and support its passage.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], a member of our committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus spends slightly less than the President's budget and should be congratulated for that. It represents a reallocation of resources and, in many cases, a reallocation that I agree with, but it still, in my judgment, does not represent change.

Mr. Chairman, we have 12-year-olds who are having babies. We have 14-year-olds who are selling drugs. We have 16-year-olds who are killing each other. We have 18-year-olds who cannot even read the diplomas that they have supposedly earned. I believe this is the

legacy of the welfare state, and I believe that, if we do more of the same, we will see the continuation of what I have just described.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I support the budget being offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is primarily because it reduces the budget deficits by over \$150 billion in the next 5 years, and we need to do that. But in addition it represents true change. There is welfare reform, substantive welfare reform. There is immigration reform which is so necessary. There is health care reform in this package. There is reform of government operations, the consolidation of programs, the elimination of others. There is regulatory reform in the Kasich Republican plan. There is even a component of crime control. There is job creation and economic growth in the Kasich Republican plan. There is also a family tax credit that says, "If you have a child, you will get \$500 from the Federal Government if your income is less than \$200,000. If you have two children, you will get a thousand dollars. If you have three children, you will get \$1,500."

Mr. Chairman, this represents a sincere effort on the part of the Republicans to recognize the pledge of the administration now in office to have a focus on the middle class and the families.

What troubles me the most, however, is the fact that when this plan of the President passed last year we were told by the Speaker and others, and I am reading from the document to get the votes necessary to pass this plan last year; the Speaker said:

We must do more. We must cut more spending, and we will. We must reallocate our priorities, and we will. We must continue the process of deficit reduction, and we will.

□ 1150

The bottom line is that the President has not and his people have not. They have done the exact opposite. They have not cut spending more, they have not reallocated priorities, and they have not continued the process of deficit reduction.

I believe that in the years to come the Congressional Black Caucus and the Republicans will recognize that we have much in common because the problems they want to address need to be addressed, and the way the Republicans want to address them is the way to help solve the problems they are concerned about.

We need welfare reform. We need to reform this Government. We simply cannot ignore the deficits. The national debt will go up to \$1.6 trillion in the next 5 years. If it goes up \$1.6 trillion in the next 5 years, we will not be able to solve our problems.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I realize that we have come to the end of this debate, and, quite frankly, I want to

offer my thanks to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER] for their efforts to put forth an honest, frank, and sincere debate on the budget to guide our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], who is the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, to close debate, and I take this opportunity to say that it was he, along with other senior members of our caucus, who began this notion of an alternative budget out of their sincere desire to bring about change and a vision of leadership for our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 6 minutes to close debate.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his generosity in yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, let me at the outset of my remarks make three points.

First, it is always with a great sense of pride that I rise in support of the efforts on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus to change the priorities of this country. Second, I rise to say to all the Members here that it has always been my belief that the most important function that we have in carrying out our responsibilities is to develop a national budget for this country.

Third, let me suggest to my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle and assert aggressively without fear of contradiction that the Congressional Black Caucus is about change and has always been about change as we have always stood on the cutting edge of change in the 23-plus years that this gentleman has served in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I have often said that if I were to travel to a country and could only read one document in order to understand the most about that nation, I would read its budget. I would read that document because a nation's budget is the expression of its national priorities, its aspirations, its vision of its place in the world and its obligation to its citizens.

As we join today in the debate on those priorities, I urge my colleagues to keep in mind this important goal of our budget process, and to understand the obvious: Money spent in one category of the budget is unavailable for other national purposes—whether within a budget line, in another budget line, or simply left in the economy through deficit reduction. This is true of the national defense line of the budget as well as of any other portion.

I rise today as a member of the House who represents a district that has been

in the forefront of communities arguing that we have a precious and obvious opportunity at this moment in history to turn dramatically to a course of rebuilding our Nation from the resources that we no longer have to spend on what was characterized as the cold war. I do not rise as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, or speak on behalf of that committee—a committee which must have its debate on how forces will be molded within the framework of the budget resolution target.

However, as a member and now chairman of that committee, this member has had a profound opportunity to focus closely on the defense budget and on the relation of that budget to our national needs.

There are those who will argue today and the Budget Committee heard many voices arguing that defense has borne more than its share of deficit reduction, that the President has already cut defense drastically, and that further cuts would produce a hollow force and endanger national security. In particular, some cite the Defense Department's Bottom-Up Review force structure as a minimum level for national security, and any cuts below the President's budget are alleged to endanger the Nation's ability to support that force level.

In the view of this gentleman, these arguments are all built on faulty premises.

As to defense already having absorbed its fair share of budget cuts, the question is not how much defense has been cut but rather whether we still have more of a budget and force structure than we need to keep the country safe, meet our national security needs and our foreign policy obligations and interests. With the end of the cold war and the demise of the Soviet military as a global threat, the need for defense forces went down dramatically.

Moreover, defense is the only major budget function of which it can be said that objective circumstances have produced a decline in mission. In this time where additional domestic investment and social programs are urgently needed, every penny of unnecessary defense spending must be eliminated and transferred to more productive uses. In addition, we must remember that securing our economy is one of the four cornerstones of our national security policy—a failure properly to size our defense budget imperils that policy goal.

There is good reason to believe that defense could be cut further than it has been already. At the end of the current build-down, U.S. defense spending will still equate to 80 percent of the average purchasing power devoted to defense during the cold war, excluding periods where we were actually engaged in military hostilities. Needless to say, there is no threat on the horizon any where near 80 percent as large as that

posed by the nuclear-armed Red Army, much less that army and its alliance structure. In fact, the United States military is now larger than that of Russia. Under current plans, the United States will vastly out-spend all of its plausible military antagonists put together. By themselves, our European allies and Japan will spend more than Russia and China.

The Clinton administration, far from cutting too deeply, is actually providing robustly for defense. It plans increases in key elements of military capability. By the end of the decade, the United States plans to have more early-arriving ground combat capability for regional conflicts than it did at the time of Desert Storm, and an order of magnitude more capability for delivering precision-guided munitions from the air. Just since last year at this time, President Clinton has added over \$24 billion to its 5 year defense plan.

The Clinton defense program is only about 6 percent lower in real program terms than that of the previous administration, and it was common knowledge that the Cheney Pentagon was planning further cuts in defense for a second Bush administration. Our current military is the best trained and most ready in history. Compared to other post-cold war draw-downs, this one has been shallower and less steep. By reducing force structure and placing a priority on readiness, all indications are that a return to the hollow force of the 1970's can be avoided. In fact, current projections show per-unit readiness spending remaining at the high levels reached in the Reagan years.

Finally, the Bottom-Up Review, as Defense Secretary Perry acknowledged before the Armed Services Committee, is incomplete in some important respects and must be considered to be an evolving document. The force structure levels it recommended it were developed without consideration of major operational changes, further reductions in nuclear forces, or realignments in roles and missions. It pretty much asked what elements of the current force—as built and operated during the cold war—should be retained if we as a nation wish to build toward a capability to conduct offensive armored warfare in two major regional contingencies at once—without participation by our military allies.

This is a substantially more stringent force planning criterion than was established by the Bush administration. New investment—especially in the area of strategic mobility and other supporting forces—will be required to achieve such a war-fighting capability; we do not have it today.

The Bottom-Up Review also programs additional naval forces for overseas presence—requirements that operational changes might obviate. To keep the Bottom-Up Review force modern

will require additional investment after the turn of the century, and so either defense budget increases, further force cuts, or an increased reliance on National Guard and Reserve Forces will be required at that time.

The wisdom of building up to meet such a planning criterion is open to question—especially since both Gen. Colin Powell and Defense Secretary Perry have suggested that fighting two wars at once is unlikely in the extreme. Planning to fight two wars at once without our NATO allies is questionable in view of the American public's desire for more multilateralism and burden-sharing in national security. In the case of the Korean contingency, economic growth in the South and isolation and adversity in the North suggest that the South will increasingly be able to take up a greater share of the burden of its own defense.

Thus, in brief, our defense effort dominates the world military scene and the Clinton administration plans a ready and robust military force that does not take full advantage of the end of the cold war, that appears to be in excess of our national needs, and that will require either more spending or further force structure cuts in the future. For the longer term, the Congress needs to investigate alternative approaches to defense planning. Since fiscal year 1995 is still a year of substantial force reductions in the administration's plan, major force structure decisions will affect late years. At the same time, there remains an urgent need for spending on defense conversion and reinvestment, including base closure and realignment funds, to help communities, individuals, and industries adjust to the decline in defense spending and to become economically productive.

For fiscal year 1995, the administration has increased operations and maintenance spending by 13.5 percent per active-duty service member, which may be more than is needed. While the administration has cut procurement substantially, several programs are being continued for industrial base purposes that could be advanced in other, more economical ways. Thus neither the administration's 5-year plan nor its fiscal year 1995 budget should be taken as a floor for defense spending. At a minimum, defense should not be exempted from the normal nips and tucks that are part of the budget process.

Within the CBC budget alternative before you is a national security budget that can meet our legitimate national security goals, pay for our participation in multilateral peacekeeping operations, pay for the base closure and realignment procedures as well as fund urgent base cleanup. It is a budget that achieve the substantial savings in the military budget that can be real-

ized from the advent of the post-cold war era—while neither imperiling our industrial base or too hastily reducing our force structure.

It would leave a robust force, well equipped for the challenges of the twenty-first century—being able to respond with our allies to significant security challenges; improving our national economy and protecting our technology developments; equipping our forces to participate in the types of military actions that seem most likely in the future; and bringing about the types of arms control, human rights and promotion of democracy initiatives that will stabilize the world and its regional environments, thereby reducing the prospect of the armed violence that we all seek to avoid.

It is the best option on the table, in this gentleman's humble view, to meet our national security goals. It is the only option on the table that also sets forth a domestic investment agenda that speaks appropriately to the challenges—and I would assert the priorities—that we face in this time of urgent domestic crisis. And this is not a parochial document, because it seeks to meet the needs of all Americans throughout all communities.

The Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., once issued a prophetic statement about the Vietnam war's effect on our national priorities. He said that the bombs we were then dropping on Vietnam were exploding in the ghettos and the barrios of America.

That statement's relevance to today's debate should be obvious to us all. Throughout the cold war we spent hundreds of billions of dollars to prepare bombs to meet what our Nation perceived as a global challenge. Those bombs, like the ones Dr. King saw dropped in Vietnam, have exploded throughout the cities of America. They have wreaked devastation and have created hopelessness in many communities.

The CBC alternative budget that you have before you would dedicate the resources necessary to begin the rebuilding from that devastation, to rekindle the hope that nurtures the dreams of our children. In doing so, we can build a better and a stronger United States.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget amendment. The passage of a budget resolution represents the best efforts of the Nation's elected leaders to reach some consensus on National priorities for the coming fiscal year. The priorities reflected in the CBC alternative focus on meeting the needs of our most vulnerable citizens, while investing in the Nation's technology and infrastructure.

While the economy is strengthening, and consumer and business confidence increase, we cannot lose sight of those Americans who continue to be left behind—families and individuals who have little confidence in the future, and little reason to believe, that, as the economy strengthens, they will somehow share the benefits.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget recognizes that Federal programs intended to improve the lives and living conditions of Americans, and enhance opportunities for all citizens to share in economic revival, are vital investments in the future of the Nation. If this country does not act to stem poverty, unemployment, illiteracy, and homelessness, or address the lack of affordable health care, we will face a larger price tag to alleviate them in the future.

The increases in the CBC budget in education acknowledge the severe situation facing our Nation's schools, and the need for additional Federal involvement to improve the quality of elementary and secondary school facilities. The \$530 million increase in community and regional development represents a recognition of the dire circumstances of the Nation's urban and rural communities.

Notwithstanding my support for the priorities incorporated in the CBC budget document, I do have reservations about the size of defense reductions contained in the proposal. There have been enormous changes around the globe in recent years. The reevaluation of our strategic interests and defense needs continue. We must continue to scrutinize how best to use our limited resources to meet our future defense needs, but we must also take care to ensure our military readiness in the face of continued uncertainty around the world. In the coming year, the House will have the opportunity to debate many of the goals prioritized in the CBC budget alternative, as we consider reforms in health care, welfare, employment and training programs, and proposals to curb violent crime. I strongly endorse the Mfume budget amendment as a valuable instrument in illustrating how these objectives can be accomplished.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus [CBC] alternative budget for fiscal year 1995, a budget to rescue America. I want to take this opportunity to commend my colleague, Congressman MFUME, chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, for his leadership in crafting this alternate budget, and bringing the CBC alternative budget to the floor as an amendment to House Concurrent Resolution 218, the budget resolution for fiscal year 1995. The CBC alternate budget is a thoughtful and serious plan designed to meet the pressing domestic needs of our Nation, while keeping very close to the overall deficit reduction numbers contained in the President's proposal, and the Budget Committee's resolution.

The CBC budget calls for substantially lower defense spending levels in fiscal year 1995 than the committee resolution; \$16.5 billion less in budget authority, and \$9.0 billion less in outlays. Over a 5-year period, the CBC budget recommends cuts in defense spending of \$175.1 billion in budget authority, and \$125.3 billion in outlays below the levels contained in the Budget Committee resolution. Our alternative budget uses these savings to fund desperately needed increases in funding for vital domestic programs, such as education, job training, health, and crime prevention.

The Defense spending levels called for in the CBC budget are directly in keeping with U.S. Military requirements for the post-cold

war world, and are adequate to meet any projected threat from a regional power. In addition, we recognize that an expanded policy of burden-sharing by our allies will help reduce our Nation's defense funding needs. The CBC budget assumes that savings from personnel reductions resulting from Military downsizing will be directed to job training, severance pay, and pension benefits for individuals separated from the Military or civilian service. We also assume that \$3 billion of the savings will be designated for plant restructuring, job training and income support for communities with military-dependent economies.

Mr. Chairman, the CBC alternate budget uses a portion of the savings realized from reduced defense spending to fund education and training programs to increase employment, especially for health care related jobs. These savings will also help raise the maximum Pell Grant award from \$2,300 to \$2,500, and expand chapter 1 compensatory services to 75 percent of eligible children. Additional savings from defense will be used to improve transportation and veterans programs, and expand income security programs.

I am especially pleased that the CBC alternative budget calls for a redirection of savings to increases in health programs, specifically towards programs which serve the minority community. Reform of our Nation's health care delivery system is of utmost importance to African-Americans and other minorities who, despite the tremendous medical advances in this country, have not benefited fully or equitably from these gains. This crisis in health for African-Americans has been well documented in recent years, and is a driving force behind the movement toward national health care reform. The CBC budget for health programs will provide assistance to minority health providers until a comprehensive, universal health care reform package can be enacted, and implemented.

Crime prevention is an issue of primary concern to nearly every American, and the Congressional Black Caucus is alarmed by the crime epidemic in our country. We seek to address this urgent National issue through increased funding of crime prevention programs, funded from savings from the defense budget, and new taxes on the three most immediate threats to the health of African-Americans; assault weapons, handguns and ammunition. The tragedy of drive-by shootings, and the escalation of handgun violence in domestic disputes, are placing a tremendous strain on our health care system, especially since a large proportion of the emergency medical care necessitated by these incidents is provided to individuals with inadequate or no health insurance.

Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus budget has been crafted to meet the true needs of the American people, while adhering to the goal of deficit reduction established in President Clinton's 5-year deficit reduction plan enacted last year. The CBC budget is a comprehensive, intelligent and compassionate answer to the competing interests of increased domestic investment and significant deficit reduction. I strongly urge all my colleagues to support this plan, and to vote in favor of the Mfume amendment to the budget resolution for fiscal year 1995.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, since the Clinton administration began, there have been two disaster relief appropriations: \$6 billion for Midwest flood disaster relief and \$8 billion for far west earthquake disaster relief. In the last year of the Bush administration, billions were appropriated for Southern hurricane disaster relief. The Congressional Black Caucus [CBC] substitute offered today represents the key components of an education and employment disaster relief program for long neglected, inner-city disaster areas. A "jobquake" has wrecked our cities for the past 12 years. This is a disaster which deserves fair and equal treatment. A population far greater than the combined populations in the three disaster areas I have mentioned is victimized by public policies which are discriminatory and short-sighted.

Consistent with our position in the CBC budget of 1994, we again insist that "an overwhelming campaign for the improvement of education in all American schools is needed." Emergency Federal funding for education is needed to help alleviate the disaster which has resulted from combined Federal, State, and local budget cuts that have all but wrecked many urban school systems. Twelve years of draining resources from our cities to build defense plants and bankrupt shopping malls financed by the savings and loan swindle have created an employment disaster which is documented by the inner-city census tract statistics on long-term joblessness.

We owe inner-cities their fair share of disaster relief. The funding of education and job training programs represents the simplest and most effective vehicle for the delivery of disaster relief to these neighborhoods in turmoil.

At the heart of the education and employment disaster relief program is an increase of \$1 billion for training and employment programs for jobs in the health care sector. Even before the passage of health care reform legislation, there is already a shortage of jobs in many allied health professions such as child care workers, medical record clerks, practical nurses, physician's assistants, and medical technicians. Most of these occupations require 2 years of training; a few require only 1-year of training. Instead of transferring funds for youth training programs out of the cities to dislocated defense workers who have enjoyed full employment for at least 10 of the last 15 years, we propose that the funding for youth training programs be increased on the condition that only 1-year training programs be funded.

Adult training programs also should be increased in order to cover the cost of 1-year and 2-year programs focused on health care-related jobs. Employment is guaranteed at the end of the training cycle for participants in health care training programs. Welfare recipients faced with the 2-year ultimatum may greatly benefit from job training in this category where wages are high enough to provide significant incentives and long-term employment.

Other programs included in this 1995 CBC budget which were not in the 1994 budget are: First, an Education Infrastructure Act to provide emergency funds for the repair and renovation of schools, asbestos, and lead poisoning abatement, and other needs; second, a

family learning center program for libraries to guarantee access for the poor to the information superhighways; third, opportunity to learn incentive grants are proposed to encourage selected local education agencies to match their proposals for curriculum content improvements and increased testing with concrete proposals for improvements in the education delivery systems; and fourth, a school-based building construction training program to expand the model already developed by the Youth Build experimental programs.

The CBC substitute represents the best possible reordering of Federal budget priorities. Moreover, the substitute includes deficit levels over a 5-year period which are slightly less than those in the committee resolution.

This substitute is not a radical proposition. It has only \$9 billion less in defense outlays than the committee resolution for fiscal year 1995. In cutting defense, while we envision personnel reductions, we also commit \$3 billion to plant restructuring, retooling, job training, and income support for communities with military-dependent economies. To help pay for this, we insist on our allies finally stepping up to the plate and carrying their fair share of the burden of global security.

We must ask ourselves whether we want a budget which reflects the needs of the people, or a budget which reflects the desires of high-priced military contractors and high-paid lobbyists of large corporations. I think that the voters answered that question loud and clear in the 1992 election, and we have a duty to live up to their expectations.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I, like many of my colleagues, am very pleased that the President has submitted a budget that pays more than lipservice to the needs of Americans, both poor and not so poor. I applaud his efforts but I must say that the plan that has been reported to the floor of this body has fallen short of the needs of my constituents who have been ignored by past administrations for so long. For that reason, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget.

The CBC budget increases funding in several important areas such as community development. By providing \$650 million for community development banks, banks like Chicago's South Shore Bank and programs like the Women's Self Employment Project may have more opportunity to show the world that people can provide for themselves if given the opportunity through good lending programs. These initiatives provide self-starting low-income citizens the ability to get capital to start businesses that will create for them a way out of poverty. I can think of no better way to invest in the future of America but to tap the potential that is dormant today among the poor in our communities.

The CBC budget puts a premium on education and training. It provides \$1.9 billion more in fiscal year 1995 budget authority and \$19 billion more in budget authority over 5 years than the committee resolution for education, training, and social services programs. In addition it specifically raises the Pell Grant maximum awards from \$2,300 to \$2,500. This change brings this program a little closer to the reality of college costs in 1994 which, as any of you with children can appreciate, have

grown dramatically. The importance of this program cannot be overstated. Pell grants are a major way that we ensure that the hope of a better life exists for children growing up poor in America.

This budget also provides more funding for substance abuse prevention and treatment. By getting at some of these root problems, we can really fight crime more cost effectively than by building more prisons which house rather than rehabilitate. The residents of my district know that we must find funds in any budget we approve to tackle this very difficult problem. In some areas of the Seventh Congressional District, they see the constant late night traffic on their streets and the strangers who visit frequently. Every recognized authority on the subject has pointed to the need for more treatment and the targeting of our resources toward hard to reach and at-risk populations along with increased law enforcement. The CBC alternative provides for both.

Additional funds for transportation, community development block grants and other infrastructure-building programs will shore up our physical communities while they provide needed jobs to fan the flames of the economic recovery which has only just begun to burn.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the Congressional Black Caucus have offered this alternative. At some point we must focus on the social and economic disasters that our cities and communities are coming to resemble. If not today, what? I urge my colleagues to support this reasoned and principled alternative budget proposal.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus substitute budget resolution and commend Chairman MFUME and the Congressional Black Caucus for their leadership and vision in presenting this alternative.

Essentially this alternative budget proposes to accelerate savings from defense accounts and accelerate investments in education, training, health, and social services. This alternative is about investing in people and our future. The substitute assumes greater funding for job training and job creation—it responds to the goals of both welfare reform and crime prevention. It offers hope to the young people of America's cities.

Expansion of the Jobs Corps is an example of building on what we know works best. For 30 years, this program has helped disadvantaged young people turn their lives around. As you all know, job training programs are expensive, however, these programs are far less expensive than housing unskilled young people in prisons after they turn to crime. This budget offers us the opportunity to prevent crime and give hope to American youth.

Our Federal budget is a statement of our national values. This alternative budget resolution represents the best of the American dream. I urge my colleagues to support the MFume substitute.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, today we have a great opportunity to redirect our Nation's spending priorities and enact a Federal budget that not only continues the course of economic recovery but realizes new horizons on the path to longlasting prosperity. This budget alternative will put our Nation back to work, house our homeless, feed the hungry and expand health care services.

The Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget is designed to restore the spirit of human kindness that has too long been lacking in national policy. Mr. Chairman, a nation is only as strong as its weakest citizens; the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget is foremost about meeting the special needs of the poor, the elderly and the disenfranchised.

During the decade of the 1980's the Federal budget was designed by those promoting the trickle down theory and their programs failed to serve the basic needs of American people. A sea change in Washington began last year and no one in this body can afford to ignore the cries for change which have been voiced by people in every community across this Nation. Mr. Chairman, it is time for real leaders to step forward and advocate progressive alternatives. The Congressional Black Caucus budget would reorient our national programs to solve the devastating problems we can no longer afford to tolerate. The only way to revitalize our Nation and rebuild our communities is from the bottom up. As long as we fail to realistically address the root causes of poverty, racism and sexism, this Nation will not grow or prosper.

Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget addresses the real needs of our Nation and nurtures lasting economic growth and vitality. I urge my colleagues to support this bold agenda for change.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 81, noes 326, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

AYES—81

Andrews (ME)	Ford (MI)	Rangel
Barrett (WI)	Frank (MA)	Richardson
Becerra	Furse	Romero-Barcelo
Bishop	Gekas	(PR)
Blackwell	Green	Roybal-Allard
Bonior	Hamburg	Rush
Brown (CA)	Hilliard	Sabo
Brown (FL)	Hinchey	Sanders
Clay	Jacobs	Schroeder
Clayton	Jefferson	Scott
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Serrano
Collins (MI)	Kennedy	Shays
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Stark
Coyne	Maloney	Stokes
de Lugo (VI)	Markey	Thompson
Dellums	McDermott	Torres
Dixon	McKinney	Tucker
Edwards (CA)	Meek	Underwood (GU)
Ehlers	Menendez	Velazquez
Engel	Mfume	Vento
Evans	Mineta	Washington
Faleomavaega	Mink	Waters
(AS)	Nadler	Watt
Farr	Norton (DC)	Wheat
Fields (LA)	Oliver	Woolsey
Finer	Owens	Wynn
Flake	Pastor	Yates
Foglietta	Payne (NJ)	

NOES—326

Ackerman Frost Mazzoli
Allard Gallegly McCandless
Andrews (NJ) Gejdenson McCloskey
Applegate Geren McCollum
Archer Gilchrist McCrery
Armey Gillmor McCurdy
Bacchus (FL) Gilman McDade
Bacchus (AL) Gingrich McHale
Baesler Glickman McHugh
Baker (CA) Gonzalez McInnis
Baker (LA) Goodlatte McKeon
Ballenger Goodling McNulty
Barca Gordon Meyers
Barcia Goss Mica
Barlow Grams Michel
Barrett (NE) Grandy Miller (FL)
Bartlett Greenwood Minge
Batteman Gunderson Moakley
Beilenson Hall (OH) Molinari
Bentley Hall (TX) Mollohan
Bereuter Hamilton Montgomery
Berman Hancock Moorhead
Bevill Hansen Moran
Bilbray Harman Morella
Bilirakis Hastert Murphy
Billey Hefley Murtha
Blute Hefner Myers
Boehrlert Herger Neal (MA)
Boehner Hoagland Nussle
Bonilla Hobson Oberstar
Borski Hochbrueckner Obey
Boucher Hoekstra Ortiz
Brewster Hoke Oxley
Browder Holden Packard
Brown (OH) Horn Pallone
Bryant Houghton Parker
Bunning Hoyer Paxon
Burton Huffington Payne (VA)
Buyer Hughes Penny
Byrne Hunter Peterson (FL)
Callahan Hutchinson Peterson (MN)
Calvert Hutto Petri
Camp Hyde Pickett
Canady Inglis Pickle
Cantwell Inhofe Pombo
Cardin Inslee Pomeroy
Carr Istook Porter
Castle Johnson (CT) Portman
Chapman Johnson (GA) Poshard
Clement Johnson (SD) Price (NC)
Clinger Johnson, Sam Pryce (OH)
Coble Johnston Quillen
Coleman Kanjorski Quinn
Collins (GA) Kaptur Rahall
Combest Kasich Ramstad
Condit Kennelly Ravenel
Cooper Kildee Reed
Coppersmith Kim Regula
Costello King Ridge
Cramer Kingston Roberts
Crapo Kleczka Roemer
Cunningham Klein Rogers
Danner Klink Rohrabacher
Darden Klug Ros-Lehtinen
de la Garza Knollenberg Rose
Deal Kolbe Roth
DeFazio Kreidler Roukema
DeLauro Kyl Rowland
DeLay LaFalce Royce
Derrick Lambert Sangmeister
Deutsch Lancaster Santorum
Diaz-Balart Lantos Sarpalius
Dickey LaRocco Sawyer
Dicks Laughlin Saxton
Dingell Lazio Schaefer
Doolittle Leach Schenk
Dornan Lehman Schiff
Dreier Levin Schumer
Duncan Levy Sensenbrenner
Dunn Lewis (FL) Sharp
Durbin Linder Shepherd
Edwards (TX) Lipinski Shuster
Emerson Livingston Sisisky
English Lloyd Skaggs
Eshoo Long Skeen
Everett Lowey Skelton
Ewing Machtley Slaughter
Fawell Mann Smith (IA)
Fazio Manton Smith (MI)
Fingerhut Manzullo Smith (NJ)
Fish Margolies Smith (OR)
Fowler Mezvinsky Smith (TX)
Franks (CT) Martinez Snowe
Franks (NJ) Matsui Solomon

Spence Taylor (MS)
Spratt Taylor (NC)
Stearns Tejeda
Stenholm Thomas (CA)
Strickland Thomas (WY)
Studds Thornton
Stump Thurman
Stupak Torkildsen
Sundquist Torricelli
Sweet Trafficant
Swift Unsoeld
Synar Upton
Talent Valentine
Tanner Visclosky
Tauzin Volkmer

Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waxman
Weldon
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wyden
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—31

Abercrombie Gephardt
Andrews (TX) Gibbons
Barton Gutierrez
Brooks Hastings
Collins (IL) Hayes
Cox Kopetski
Crane Lewis (CA)
Dooley Lightfoot
Fields (TX) McMillan
Ford (TN) Meehan
Gallo Miller (CA)

Natcher
Neal (NC)
Orton
Pelosi
Reynolds
Rostenkowski
Shaw
Slattery
Towns

□ 1219

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:
Mr. Abercrombie for, with Mr. Dooley against.

Mrs. Collins of Illinois for, with Mr. Orton against.

Mr. Meehan for, with Mr. Slattery against.

Mr. HEFNER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. BARRETT of Wisconsin, CONYERS, and MARKEY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TORRICELLI) assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate with amendments. The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3345) "An Act to provide temporary authority to Government agencies relating to voluntary separation incentive payments, and for other purposes" and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GLENN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. SASSER, Mr. ROTH, and Mr. STEVENS, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1995

The Committee resumed its sitting.

□ 1221

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 103-429.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. KASICH

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. KASICH:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995.

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1995, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, October 1, 1997, and October 1, 1998:

(1) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$971,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$1,010,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,057,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,106,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,150,800,000,000.

and the amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be decreased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$6,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$21,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$22,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$29,972,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$39,154,000,000.

and the amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$100,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$106,324,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$111,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$117,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$123,669,000,000.

(2) The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,194,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$1,236,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,298,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,372,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,440,300,000,000.

(3) The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,204,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$1,229,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,290,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,106,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,150,800,000,000.

(4) The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$233,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1996: \$219,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 1997: \$233,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 1998: \$244,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 1999: \$272,100,000,000.

(5) The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995: \$4,963,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$5,269,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997: \$5,593,900,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998: \$5,971,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999: \$6,292,000,000,000.

(6) The appropriate levels of total Federal credit activity for the fiscal years beginning on October 1, 1994, October 1, 1995, October 1, 1996, October 1, 1997, and October 1, 1998, are as follows:

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$26,000,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$196,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$30,400,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$170,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$31,900,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$160,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$33,700,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$159,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New direct loan obligations, \$35,900,000,000.

(B) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$160,800,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1995 through 1999 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$269,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$275,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$266,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$270,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$265,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$269,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$275,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$272,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$284,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$275,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$15,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$17,000,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$17,500,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,600,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$17,500,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$17,500,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$17,000,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$16,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$9,900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$6,300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$9,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$8,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$4,600,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$8,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$4,600,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$8,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$4,600,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$10,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$8,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$4,600,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$117,900,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$130,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$103,200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$110,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$95,900,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$110,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$96,600,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$110,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$99,500,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$110,000,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$11,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,800,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,800,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,800,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,800,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$2,800,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$50,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$5,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$19,200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$46,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$11,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$14,400,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$47,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$13,200,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$13,600,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$48,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$15,100,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$12,700,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$49,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$16,900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$11,600,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$122,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$121,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$130,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$130,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,800,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,800,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$11,900,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, \$246,200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$246,200,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, \$264,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$264,100,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$276,600,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$276,600,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$289,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$289,000,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$303,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$303,300,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, \$3,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$2,600,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,800,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$8,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$8,300,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$10,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$10,600,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$12,300,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, \$36,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$36,800,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, \$32,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$32,500,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1997:

- (A) New budget authority, \$31,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$31,900,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1998:

- (A) New budget authority, \$33,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$33,300,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1999:

- (A) New budget authority, \$34,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$34,300,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

SEC. 4. RECONCILIATION.

(a) Not later than May 16, 1994, the House committees named in subsections (b) through (p) of this section shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill or resolution carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(b) Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending, sufficient to increase outlays as follows: \$637,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, and to reduce outlays as follows: \$7,682,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$5,884,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$4,733,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$1,759,000,000 in fiscal year 1999, and program changes in laws with-

in its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$3,042,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$3,780,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$4,777,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$5,367,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$5,933,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

(c) Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction that provide program changes, sufficient to result in a reduction in outlays as follows: \$17,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$27,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$32,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$33,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$34,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

(d) Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending, sufficient to reduce outlays as follows: \$510,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$297,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$613,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$814,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$1,022,000,000 in fiscal year 1999, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$2,332,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$2,170,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$2,777,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$3,062,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$3,263,000 in fiscal year 1999.

(e) Committee on Education and Labor shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending, sufficient to reduce outlays as follows: \$1,339,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$9,230,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$7,517,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$6,383,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$3,409,000,000 in fiscal year 1999, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$951,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$3,024,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$3,541,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$3,695,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$3,808,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

(f) Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending, sufficient to reduce outlays as follows: \$2,685,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$7,056,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$7,538,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$9,319,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$11,482,000,000 in fiscal year 1999, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$107,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$227,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$340,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$316,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$354,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

(g) Committee on Foreign Affairs shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction, program changes, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$602,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$1,319,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$1,579,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$1,712,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$1,824,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

(h) Committee on Government Operations shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction that provide program changes, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$704,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$2,092,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$2,802,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$3,258,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$3,406,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

(i) Committee on House Administration shall report program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$0 in fiscal year 1995, \$0 in fiscal year 1996, \$52,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$84,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$94,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

(j) Committee on Judiciary shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending, sufficient to reduce outlays as follows: \$0 in fiscal year 1995, \$0 in

fiscal year 1996, \$56,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$58,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$60,000,000 in fiscal year 1999, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$94,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$419,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$577,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$675,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$503,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

(k) Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending, sufficient to reduce outlays as follows: \$103,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$103,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$103,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$103,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$103,000,000 in fiscal year 1999, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$3,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$108,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$112,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$114,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$114,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

(l) Committee on Natural Resources shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending, sufficient to reduce outlays as follows: \$233,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$2,433,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$1,177,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$1,190,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$1,196,000,000 in fiscal year 1999, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$1,089,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$1,505,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$1,810,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$2,125,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$2,440,000 in fiscal year 1999.

(m) Committee on Post Office and Civil Service shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending, sufficient to reduce outlays as follows: \$0 in fiscal year 1995, \$2,050,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$3,100,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$3,150,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$3,250,000,000 in fiscal year 1999, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$1,751,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$3,578,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$5,353,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$7,198,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$8,753,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

(n) Committee on Public Works and Transportation shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending, sufficient to increase outlays as follows: \$2,251,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$2,490,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$2,782,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$3,079,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$3,388,000,000 in fiscal year 1999, and program changes in laws within its jurisdiction, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$6,660,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$7,686,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$8,749,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$9,742,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$10,638,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

(o) Committee on Small Business shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction that provide program changes, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$114,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$182,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$214,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$238,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$251,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

(p) Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction that provide program changes, sufficient to result in a reduction of outlays as follows: \$0 in fiscal year 1995, \$0 in fiscal year 1996, \$0 in fiscal year 1997, \$0 in fiscal year 1998, and \$327,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

(q)(1) Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction that provide sufficient to reduce outlays as follows: \$5,219,000,000 in fiscal year 1995,

\$15,451,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$15,190,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$15,258,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$14,818,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

(2) Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues as follows: \$6,706,000,000 in fiscal year 1995, \$21,012,000,000 in fiscal year 1996, \$22,489,000,000 in fiscal year 1997, \$29,972,000,000 in fiscal year 1998, and \$39,154,000,000 in fiscal year 1999.

SEC. 5. SENSE OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON SCORING HEALTH REFORM.

It is the sense of the Committee on the Budget that all financial transactions associated with the President's health reform legislation or similar health reform legislation relying on mandated payments to a Government entity be treated as part of the Federal budget, including premium payments by individuals and employees to health alliances (which should be treated as receipts) and payments by health alliances to providers (which should be treated as outlays), for all purposes under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 6. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING RESERVE FUNDS FOR EMERGENCIES.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the emergency designation under section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 has repeatedly been invoked to circumvent the discretionary spending limits for other than emergency purposes;

(2) amounts for emergencies should be set aside within a reserve fund and subject to the discretionary spending limit;

(3) the reserve fund shall total 1 percent of annual domestic discretionary budget authority; and

(4) emergency funding requirements in excess of amounts held in the reserve fund should be offset by a reduction in appropriations.

SEC. 7. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING UNFUNDED MANDATES.

(a) It is the sense of Congress that legislation and appropriate House and Senate rules amendments should be adopted that—

(1) requires the Congressional Budget Office to estimate the cost of unfunded Federal mandates in all legislation before such legislation is considered by a full committee or by the full House or Senate;

(2) prohibits consideration in the House or Senate of legislation creating or expanding a Federal mandate that increases the net cost to State and local governments of complying with all Federal mandates (subject to a waiver by a three-fifths majority);

(3) charges the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs in the Office of Management and Budget with monitoring all unfunded Federal mandates and identifying those mandates that should be repealed; and

(4) codifies the recommendations of the National Performance Review for broad agency waiver authority and bottom-up grant consolidation.

SEC. 8. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING REGULATORY BUDGETING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the cost of compliance with Federal regulations—

(1) constitutes a real, albeit an invisible, tax on America's private and public sectors;

(2) will cost the American private sector over \$600,000,000 in 1995; and

(3) will exceed 9 percent of the Nation's Gross Domestic Product and annually cost the average household between \$6,565 and \$8,869.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that the Federal Government should adopt a regulatory budget that encompasses the economic impact of Federal regulations on the national economy. The ultimate goal of the regulatory budget should be to limit the cost of private and public compliance with Federal regulations to a fixed percentage of the Nation's Gross Domestic Product.

SEC. 9. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING BASELINES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the baseline budget shows the likely course of Federal revenues and spending if policies remain unchanged;

(2) baseline budgeting has given rise to the practice of calculating policy changes from inflated spending levels; and

(3) the baseline concept has been misused to portray policies that would simply slow down the increase in spending as spending reductions.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the President should submit a budget that compares proposed spending levels for the budget year with the current year; and

(2) the starting point for deliberations on a budget resolution should be the current year.

SEC. 10. ADJUSTMENT OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD.

It is the sense of the Congress that upon enactment of a reconciliation bill pursuant to section 4, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall reduce the balances of direct spending and receipts legislation applicable to each fiscal year under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 by an amount equal to the net change in the deficit achieved through the enactment in that Act of direct spending and receipts legislation for that year.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

The Kasich budget resolution moves this Nation in the right direction, and for the most part, is consistent with the pressing need for our Nation to regain its prominence in the global economy.

I would commend to my colleagues, attention a series of articles in the New York Times this week on "Staying Afloat in the 1990's." It is an excellent analysis of the fears and frustrations facing the American middle class, and I would ask that these articles be included in the RECORD as part of my statement. They are the stories of young college graduates who cannot find jobs, let alone good ones, and of hard-working Americans who see their jobs evaporating, next week or next year. These people rightfully see themselves falling, ever more rapidly, from the middle class. We must take action to reverse these trends.

The Kasich budget moves to get our fiscal house in order so that this generation of Americans and the next can confidently look

forward to a future of good jobs at good pay, and a rightful place in a growing and economically secure middle class.

No, I don't agree with every detail of this budget. For example, I strongly oppose the \$500 tax credit per child, for those with \$200,000 per year incomes. If a deduction is included at all, there should be an income cap to target the deductions for middle-income families. But this can be taken up in the tax bill and appropriately targeted.

I also do not agree that cuts and adjusted means testing of higher income seniors and Medicare should be defined today. This needs much more work, and a much more thorough examination. Moreover, it should only be done, if at all, in the context of health care reform that preserves Medicare, and expands coverage for prescription drugs and extended care.

Nevertheless, the Kasich budget has great merit. It puts into concrete responsible spending and tax policies, and an economic blueprint for the country.

Our deficit and profligate spending ways are undermining our economy, both short-term and long-term. In other words, as I have repeated time after time over recent years like a mantra: We need to save and invest in America.

SAVE AND INVEST IN AMERICA

Saving and investing in America is all about improving our economy and international competitiveness, enabling Americans to get quality jobs, and continued deficit reduction.

The fact is the Kasich substitute incorporates many of the very ideas I have so vigorously supported, including full deductibility for IRA's, a neutral cost recovery system, and an extension of the R&D tax credit. It is measures like these that will encourage U.S. business to invest in new plants and equipment to become more competitive in the ongoing global economic wars.

DEFICIT REDUCTION/TRUTH-IN-BUDGETING

The Republican budget package provides real deficit reduction. The Kasich substitute would reduce the deficit by roughly \$310 billion over 5 years. I am also pleased that this plan, unlike the President's budget, incorporates the cost of reforming our Nation's health care system, welfare reform, and crime control. Admittedly, these subjects are complex and the estimates we include are subject to close reviews legislatively. But it remains that if we are to be intellectually honest about our spending priorities, we must have truth in budgeting, and at least acknowledge some cost of these efforts now. The American public has told Congress that these important issues are their top priority. Now it is the Congress' job to give these issues top priority in the budget.

Every Member of this body supports health care reform, although we may disagree as to how our Nation's health care system should be reformed. However, it is irresponsible for the Sabo substitute amendment to ignore the substantial budgetary impact of health care reform. If Congress is really serious about enacted comprehensive health care reform, we should be building the necessary funding into the fiscal year 1995 budget right now. Once again, only the Republican substitute amendments budget for health care reform.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The Republican budget resolution, in stark contrast to that offered by the majority, includes funding for health care reform, notably comprehensive health insurance reform, and the provisions of H.R. 3080, the Affordable Health Care Now Act of 1993.

I am a cosponsor of this legislation, introduced by Republican leader BOB MICHEL. The Michel bill represents a solid first step toward comprehensive health care reform. Foremost, H.R. 3080 would enact comprehensive health insurance reform, restricting insurance companies' ability to deny coverage for preexisting conditions; ability to deny coverage for preexisting conditions; requiring insurers to enroll applicants regardless of health status; and limiting premium increases through community rating.

In addition, the Michel bill includes comprehensive medical malpractice reform; an expanded use of small employer health insurance purchasing pools; administrative simplification; and an expansion of Medicaid to cover more low-income individuals. Each of these provisions, which enjoy broad support, is funded in this budget.

Moreover, the health care funding provisions in this budget addresses the most glaring problems of our system, and can improve the lives and health care of millions of Americans, without radical restructuring of our health care system, vast increases in spending and taxes, and decimation of our Medicare Program.

WELFARE REFORM

The Kasich substitute also includes funding for the comprehensive welfare reform provisions offered by House Republicans.

The funding contained for the welfare reform provisions in this bill reaffirm our fundamental belief that we must enact reform based on individual responsibility. Furthermore, welfare reform must restore our public assistance system to its original purpose: A temporary safety net for those in need—not a permanent way of life or web of dependency.

Foremost, our legislation would limit welfare benefits to 2 years—after that time, welfare recipients would have to work for their check. Furthermore, our bill would require welfare recipients to enroll in job training and education programs designed to get them off welfare; allow States to eliminate separate AFDC benefits for families with parents under age 18; require under-age children to be attending school regularly; and finally, eliminate welfare benefits for illegal aliens and other noncitizens.

This budget also includes funding for the bipartisan Roukema amendment, which would require women, as a condition of receiving a welfare check from the government, to have their children vaccinated and up to date on their immunizations, and greatly restricts the ability of States to increase AFDC benefits for additional children born to mothers already on welfare.

This budget tells mothers already on welfare that if they decide to have another child, the Federal Government will not subsidize that choice. Or as one supporter put it: Welfare families must be faced with the same tough choices every working American makes—can we afford another child, and how will we make our budget meet these choices?

Finally, this budget resolution makes a down payment on what must be the most crucial element of welfare reform, effective child support enforcement. Too many parents fail to pay court-ordered child support, neglecting their legal and financial obligation to their children. Failure to pay timely support ultimately pushes families into our welfare system, and the taxpayer picks up the tab for these deadbeat dads and sometimes moms. By improving our child support system, we can take action as welfare prevention.

I have introduced a comprehensive child support enforcement reform bill (H.R. 1600) which largely tracks the recommendations of the U.S. Commission on Interstate Child Support Enforcement. The funding in this budget for welfare reform incorporates some of these provisions, including increased paternity establishment initiatives; a national W-4 reporting form for child support obligors; and increased access to the national computer networks for locating and dunning deadbeat parents.

More must be done in this critical, welfare prevention, effort. But this budget resolution takes solid first steps toward the comprehensive reform of our child support enforcement system which must be central to the welfare reform debate.

CRIME CONTROL

Finally, this budget provides funding for one of the most critical issues facing Americans today: crime control.

Our crime situation is out of control, and in need of urgent action. Citizens are not safe in their homes, and children can not walk to school or play in the yard without fear of mounting crime and violence.

Clearly, we must act now to control crime, and close the revolving door of justice that puts criminals back on the streets. Our laws must act to punish the criminal, and safeguard law-abiding citizens. We must take back our streets.

This budget does exactly that, fully funding the comprehensive Republican anticrime bill. This budget resolution includes \$2 billion for more cops on the beat, and \$3 billion for Federal-State partnerships for building new prisons.

If we are to be serious about three strikes and you're out sentencing reforms—which the public demands of us—we must make good on the commitment to providing more police to enforce the laws, and more prisons to house violent criminals. This budget does that.

If we are to do more than just talk about crime, we must adopt this budget today, providing the funding, then enact the comprehensive anticrime bill which Democratic leaders have refused to allow on the floor of the House.

CONCLUSION

In closing, Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget resolution represents the much needed policy reforms and budgetary thinking that will start us down the road toward genuine deficit reduction and economic growth. We owe it to the American people to take these important steps to regain our national economic footing. We must get our fiscal house in order so that this generation of Americans and the next can confidently look toward a future of good jobs at good pay and a rightful place in a growing and economically secure middle class.

Support the Kasich amendment.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1994]

LOW PAY AND CLOSED DOORS GREET YOUNG IN JOB MARKET

(By Tamar Lewin)

KANSAS CITY, Mo.—Andrew Flenoy has ironed his white shirt until there are sharp creases down the sleeves. His hands are folded in his lap, his back is ramrod straight, and his feet jiggle nervously as he begins his fifth job interview in as many weeks—this one at Sprint, the long-distance telephone company that is Kansas City's largest employer.

Mr. Flenoy, 21, comes across as nervous and sweetly sincere as he tells the interviewer how much he wants the \$17,274-a-year job selling long-distance service.

Mr. Flenoy, a high school graduate who completed a year-and-a-half training course at a business trade school, is scrambling for a foothold in a work world that has turned inside out. Even in an economy that has created three million new jobs in the last three years, career positions—the old-fashioned jobs offering benefits, vacation, and room for advancement—are increasingly hard to come by.

HARD REALITY

For millions of people across the country, young and old, economists' predictions of the late 1980's have now hardened into the reality of daily life. While there are still plenty of good jobs for computer engineers, nurses and others whose skills fit the changing economy, other workers have had to reconcile themselves to a job market that has little use for them.

The recovery started almost three years ago in this heartland metropolis of 1.6 million people. In its demographic makeup and economic indicators, Kansas City closely mirrors the national average—and these days, it is a perfect exemplar of the profound changes that have transformed the American workplace for young workers like Mr. Flenoy, including these:

Once reliable employers like T.W.A. and Sears have dumped workers, and executives with master's degrees remain as vulnerable to layoffs as production-line assemblers. The unskilled castoffs of shrinking industries, used to earning \$20 an hour, are finding that the new labor market offers them no more than \$6. Many now work two or three jobs, without matching their former salary or benefits.

Temporary jobs are at their highest levels ever. There are 24.4 million part-time and temporary workers, representing 22 percent of employed Americans. In Overland Park, Kan., a well-off suburb of Kansas City, one branch office of Manpower Inc., a large temporary employment agency, filled out 4,500 W-2 forms in 1993 for employees who had worked anywhere from a day to a full year—30 percent more than the previous year.

For some skilled workers, the increasing flexibility of the work world is a boon, allowing them to change jobs at will, work when and how much they want, and earn more as employers compete for them. This group includes not only the computer engineers and other bastions of the changing economy, but also electricians and other blue-collar workers whose skills remain in demand.

With the layoffs of so many men whose paychecks once kept the family afloat, women are not merely bolstering household incomes—their salaries have become essential to maintaining a tenuous grasp on a middle-class life style. And even though women streamed into the work force during

the 1980's, the median household income in Kansas City was \$31,637 in 1980 but had slipped to \$31,613 by 1990.

While the public's perceptions of the national economy may have improved in recent months, Americans' insecurity about their own jobs is substantial and widespread, according to The New York Times Poll. Two-fifths of the work force voiced worry that during the next two years they might be laid off or forced to take pay cuts. And in the last two years, 24 percent said that in the last two years they have personally experienced layoffs, pay cuts or reductions in hours, according to the poll, taken in mid-February.

For economists and workers alike, the big question is whether the recovery will eventually spur the creation of plenty of good new jobs. Some experts say that is bound to happen, now that the explosive growth of temporary jobs has flattened.

But others say the American work force has undergone such basic structural changes that many high-paying jobs—from factory foremen to office supervisors and professionals—are gone for good.

THEIR MARKET—AMID A RECOVERY, MORE LAYOFFS

Whatever the future, the "downsizings" and "rightsizings" that began in the recession are continuing, as the largest companies here, as elsewhere, keep pruning payrolls in 100- and 1,000-worker sweeps.

Last year, Sears Roebuck here closed a distribution center, leaving more than a thousand people jobless. Other companies have also shrunk their work forces, including Marion Merrell Dow, a pharmaceutical company; Allied Signal Inc., which makes nuclear bomb parts here; Hallmark Cards, renowned around town as a benevolent employer; Colgate-Palmolive and A.T.&T.

Even a young, growing company like Sprint, with 9,000 local workers and 50,400 nationwide, had a round of layoffs in August cutting 1,000 workers nationwide, 120 of them in Kansas City. Overall, the telecommunications industry laid off 60,000 workers in the country last year.

Certainly some businesses are adding full-time, well-paying jobs with good benefits. Twentieth Century Services Inc., a mutual fund company here, has seen its work force grow from fewer than 300 eight years ago, to 1,900 now, and there are plans to add 300 to 400 this year.

Transamerica Life Insurance and Annuity Company of Los Angeles is moving 500 jobs here, and hundreds of small businesses are picking up abandoned workers and keeping the unemployment rate down to 5.4 percent last year, below the national average of 6.8 percent. And at least one employer, Ford, is adding people to its 4,000-worker plant to make the new Contour and Mercury Mystique, the successors to the Ford Tempo and Mercury Topaz.

But new jobs are not coming on stream the way they did after previous recessions. Frank Lenk, the senior economist at the Mid-America Regional Council here, calculates that in the three years since the last recession ended, the Kansas City region has gained about 20,000 jobs—compared with 93,000 jobs created after the previous downturn in the early 1980's.

THEIR JOBS—\$6 AN HOUR, 7 DAYS A WEEK

To their bitter disappointment, Mr. Flenoy and most other young workers are finding that "McJobs"—jobs that pay \$6 an hour or less, and offer little in the way of a career path—are about the only openings around.

"It just seems really difficult for my generation," said Mr. Flenoy, the oldest of six children in a rural Arkansas family.

Data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics confirm that impression: in the last decade, the average wage has fallen 5 percent, adjusted for inflation. And median full-time weekly earnings for those aged 20 to 24, expressed in 1982 dollars, dropped to \$199 in 1993, from \$215 in 1989.

While some young people with specialized skills—those with training in fields like nursing—have employers clamoring for their services, most others have a string of disappointments to recount.

Some are mailing dozens of résumés a month, and getting nothing but form-letter rejections. Others wonder why, with more education than their parents, they still cannot find work anywhere near as stable or well-paying as their parents have.

Reese Isbell is one of the lucky ones: He found work he liked just a month after graduating from the University of Missouri-Kansas City in 1992.

But these days, even lucky young people are likely to land in part-time jobs, if not internships or temporary assignments.

"I had an internship my last semester of college, working 20 hours a week in the public affairs office at Planned Parenthood, and I really liked it," said Mr. Isbell, who was a sociology major. "My father couldn't believe I would have any trouble getting a job when I graduated. He thought there would be all kinds of people recruiting me. But there weren't. I went to a temporary agency, and got a data entry job, but I hated it so much that I quit after two days."

So, Mr. Isbell leapt at the chance for a paid job at Planned Parenthood—still 20 hours a week, but now earning \$8 an hour. To make ends meet, he also took a \$7-an-hour weekend job as an admitting clerk at a hospital, a position he has kept even as the Planned Parenthood job expanded to 30 hours, and soon, to full time.

"I'm working seven days a week but I know I'm really lucky, and it wouldn't have happened without the internship," Mr. Isbell said. "My father is a computer programmer, which used to be a shoe-in, but a couple years ago he lost his job and was out there pounding the pavement at the age of 40."

THEIR PROSPECTS—WHEN COLLEGE IS NOT ENOUGH

"Reality Bites," the current movie hit about twentysomethings, reflected young workers' profound uneasiness about their job prospects. The heroine graduates as valedictorian of her college class, then is promptly dismissed from a television job where she had been warned that she could be replaced by an unpaid intern. Her boyfriend has been dismissed from 12 jobs, and she says, is "on the inside track to Nowheresville, U.S.A."

Her mother urges her to get a job at a burger place. Her best friend tries to recruit her to work at the Gap—and is offended when she says she is not interested. And when she applies for media jobs, she is rejected as overqualified at one, underqualified at the next.

"It all sounded very familiar," said Dan Wulf, a graduate of Wesleyan University in Connecticut who came to Kansas City a year and a half ago to set up a summer program for children. He now works as a secretary at the University of Kansas Medical Center during the week, and at Kinko's copy center from 2 P.M. to 11 P.M. on weekends. On Sunday mornings, he teaches Hebrew school.

He and Mr. Isbell have both concluded that to get more challenging jobs—and avoid seven-day workweeks—they will have to go to graduate school.

"We're getting more college graduates than we are college-level jobs," said Dan

Hecker of the labor statistics bureau. "About 20 percent of the college graduates end up in non-college-level jobs."

The number of college graduates working as street vendors or door-to-door salespeople grew from 57,000 in 1983 to 75,000 in 1990, the last year the statistics were compiled, according to the bureau. In the same period, the number of truck or bus drivers with college degrees grew from 99,000 to 166,000.

FROM CARHOP TO PARALEGAL

For those without college degrees, the struggle for a good job is even tougher: Renda Rush married at 17 and had her first child the following year. She began working as a carhop at Sonic Drive-In two years later and stayed there—with breaks for the birth of two more children—until the end of 1992.

What started me thinking was seeing a lot of high school girls, home for the summer, working at Sonic," said Ms. Rush, now 26. "Then in the fall, they'd go on to college, or whatever, and I'd still be there. And I finally thought, they're moving on and I've been here five years, I've got kids, and I'll be left behind forever if I don't do something about it."

Ms. Rush went back to school, choosing a two-year paralegal training program at Penn Valley Community College. And she is on her way to a career: She started as a receptionist at a personal-injury lawyer's office, but is now doing paralegal work too.

Ms. Rush, who earned \$4.85 an hour at Sonic, earns \$7 an hour, with the understanding that her pay will rise when she gets her degree later this year.

THEIR FALLBACK—A GENERATION OF TEMPS

In the recession, many employers, here and elsewhere, tried to keep their costs low by increasing their use of part-timers and temporaries, who work only during busy periods and usually get no benefits.

According to data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, employment with temporary agencies accounted for 15 percent of the new jobs created last year and 26 percent the year before—compared with less than 3 percent of the new jobs created in 1989.

In dozens of interviews with young workers in Kansas City, temping seemed to be an almost universal experience: Mr. Wulf had a weeklong job in a real estate office through a temporary agency; Mr. Isbell had his data-entry job, and Mr. Flenoy did a market-research project surveying theater-goers.

And for some young people it becomes a way of life. For a year and half now, Cabrenna Clark, 24, has been working for Kelly Services, a temporary employment agency, earning about \$6 an hour, plus some overtime. But every six months, she sends out a round of resumes for the business jobs she covets.

"I work every day, and there always seems to be another assignment when one ends," said Ms. Clark, who has completed a year and a half of college and plans to return later this year. "I've had a couple places call me back as a temp. But it seems like right now, people are more interested in working with temps than hiring for permanent jobs."

Ms. Clark said her parents, both civil servants—her mother working for the state, her father for the Federal Government—tell her she is wasting her time working as a temp.

"I don't think they understand how hard the job market is," she said. "If you're in Kansas City, and you're not in medicine or telecommunications or the military, you can just forget it. Temping is what I can do right now."

For Mr. Flenoy, what started as a temporary job has become more permanent than

he ever intended. He was hired as a temporary dishwasher at Myron Green, a Kansas City company that runs cafeterias and catering in offices and schools. After 90 days, he was offered a permanent dishwashing job, for 5.50 an hour, then was quickly promoted to cafeteria line server (\$5.75), grill cook (\$6.00) and catering manager (\$6.25).

Mr. Flenoy, the first in the family to go beyond a high school education, has come tantalizingly close to several good permanent jobs in the last two months. He was almost hired as a secretary-administrator for a church, and was one of the two final candidates for a corporate data-entry job.

But the Sprint job was the one he coveted, both because it paid more than the others, and because the company offers a generous benefit plan including tuition reimbursement that Mr. Flenoy hoped to use to further his education.

At the interview at Sprint, Mr. Flenoy began to relax as the recruiter, Mary Reiter, worked through her list of printed questions, asking him to talk about a time he tried hard and failed, a time he was too persistent, how he knows if he has done a good job. Ms. Reiter smiled encouragingly as Mr. Flenoy told about making a special effort to arrange a beautiful food tray; and thinking he had done a spectacular job—until he heard the customers' reactions.

"Normally in interviews when they ask questions, I'm completely blank, but this time it just flowed along," Mr. Flenoy said after the interview.

But a good interview was not enough: on Sprint's multiple-choice telemarketing aptitude exam, Mr. Flenoy scored too low to win another interview. So for the time being, he must stay at the food-service job.

"I'll do it as long as I have to," Mr. Flenoy said one recent morning, as he took a break from arranging a taco-bar luncheon. "But I really want some kind of business job. My resolution for 1994 is that if nothing comes along, I'll relocate and start from scratch somewhere else."

Mr. Flenoy said he knew from the time he was in high school that he wanted to leave Marianna, Ark., where his only job prospect seemed to be packing cotton or farming. He always wanted a career in business. After a semester at a community college, he moved to Kansas City, where he had relatives, and attended Wright Business School in the mornings, while working in the evenings.

Now he is tired of the burgundy and black uniform he must wear, and of the sense that he works every day from 6 A.M. to 2 P.M. just to earn enough money so that he can come back and work some more the next day.

But he does not tell his family how disheartened he is. He does not want to discourage his younger siblings.

"I'm trying my best to be very, very positive for them," he said.

[From the New York Times, March 11, 1994]

FAMILY STRUGGLES TO MAKE DO AFTER FALL FROM MIDDLE CLASS (By Dirk Johnson)

KANSAS CITY, MO.—With two cars in the garage and a swing set in the backyard, Craig Miller and his family fell easily into the suburban rhythms of Johnson County.

He was a sheet-metal worker for T.W.A. His middle-class status was stamped on the pay stub: \$15.65 an hour. And the shopping mall clerks didn't care if the paying customer wore steel-toe boots or tasseled loafers.

But the airline was troubled, and it laid Mr. Miller off in the summer of 1992. When he

began to search for another job, he quickly learned the market value of a blue-collar worker with a strong back and a good work ethic but few special skills: about \$5 an hour.

Mr. Miller, a 37-year-old father of four, now works behind the counter in a McDonald's hustling orders for Quarter Pounders and chicken fajitas and deferring to teen-age customers with "Yes, sir" and "Thank you, ma'am."

Mr. Miller also drives a school bus. And on the side he has started a small business, changing furnace filters. He printed up cards for the venture, "Sani-Max," but there has not been much demand for his service.

For the last eight years his wife, Susan, 34, has worked part time as a stock clerk at Toys R Us at night, when her husband can watch the children. She recently got a raise and now makes \$5.95 an hour.

In most ways, the nation's economy seems to be racing ahead, evident here in the spiffy shops of Country Club Plaza and the big new crop of \$200,000 houses sprouting in the corn fields on the outskirts of town.

NEW JOBS, BUT NOT ENOUGH

Throughout the country, some two million new jobs were created last year. But for people like Craig and Susan Miller, who lack college degrees as well as coveted skills, the statistics on an increasing number of jobs offer little comfort.

"Sure, we've got four of them," Mr. Miller said, managing a chuckle. "So what? So you can work like a dog for \$5 an hour."

In nearly three years since the 1990-91 recession, employers nationwide have taken on three million workers, but that is less than half as many as they hired after the 1981-82 recession. And many of the new jobs are part time or temporary.

At the same time, the number of manufacturing jobs has fallen 8.3 percent from 1989 through February 1994. Tens of thousands of jobs have moved abroad; advances in technology have taken others.

As the Millers gaze into the future from their brick-and-frame house in Overland Park, Kan., they see an employment landscape shaped like a barbell. At one end are bankers and lawyers and accountants exulting in the high-flying stock market; at the other end are countermen at fast-food franchises and clerks at big discount stores struggling to pay the bills. The solid, working-class middle ground, where the Millers once stood, has meanwhile grown narrow—and slippery.

Counting all their part-time jobs, the Millers will make about \$18,000 this year, less than half what Mr. Miller earned as a union sheet-metal worker. They have found the fall difficult to fathom, and even harder to accept. They could probably qualify for food stamps but refuse to consider applying. "We're middle-class people," Mr. Miller said. "It's just that we have a lower-class income."

THE DAILY ROUTINE

The work day starts in darkness. Mr. Miller, an Army veteran, crawls out of bed about 6 A.M., careful not to wake his youngest child, 3-year-old Amanda, who shares her parent's bedroom. By 7 A.M. he is behind the wheel of a school bus, stopping and going along tree-lined suburban streets of Overland Park. He will do it again in the late afternoon. The daily pay is \$35, no benefits.

After completing the morning bus route, he stops back at his house to change into his blue McDonald's uniform with his "Craig" name-plate pinned onto it. His restaurant job starts at 9:30 A.M., in a strip mall on Highway 69.

The pay in a fast-food restaurant is low, but the work is relentless. customers are often lined up six deep. Mr. Miller, a man who once fixed dents in the fuselages of jets and felt pride in his craft whenever a plane soared overhead, darts between the counter and the food pickup shelf, back and forth, a hundred times a day, careful not to misfile an order.

In the slower moments, he comes around the counter, dips a mop in a bucket and drags it across the floor. With the customers, he always tries to wear a polite smile, but he doesn't always meet their eyes.

"I still have some pride, you know," he said. "But what am I going to do? I think the needs of my children are a little more important than my ego."

When he took the job, Mr. Miller expected to be the oldest worker at McDonald's. He was surprised to find several people past 30.

Still wearing the McDonald's uniform, he climbs back in the school bus at 2:30 P.M. for the afternoon run. About 5, he arrives home.

Dinner is served right away, often pasta with ground turkey. The Millers never buy beef anymore.

Just before 6, Mrs. Miller leaves for her job, six hours of bending and lifting to stock the shelves with toys. It will be midnight by the time she returns home. She also works one day a week at the same McDonald's as her husband.

BATTLE WITH BILLS

Every time the telephone rings, the Millers instinctively fear that a bill collector is calling. They are \$3,000 behind in medical bills. Mrs. Miller's part-time job provides health benefits, with the company paying 80 percent of medical bills and the employee 20 percent. But with four children, even paying just 20 percent adds up. And one child recently had surgery.

When a bill collector got huffy on the phone the other day, Mrs. Miller told him wearily, "Oh, get in line."

The couple buy one newspaper a week, for the food coupons, and only one light burns in the house at a time. When a child forgets to flip off the switch, Mrs. Miller chides gently: "Have you got stock in the electric company? Well, neither do I."

Not so long ago, such worries would have seemed absurd. The Millers were saving so they could exchange their rented house for one of their own. At backyard barbecues and church picnics they moved comfortably in a social circle that included college graduates, people who wore suits to work and were therefore deemed "professional" but who often earned no more than the Millers.

When a child in school boasted of a parent who was a doctor or a lawyer, 7-year-old Peter Miller was known to reply, "My daddy can fix planes so they can fly high in the sky."

A quarter century ago, Mr. Miller remembers feeling the same kind of pride in his own blue-collar father. But the rules and rewards were simple then: if a man wasn't afraid to sweat, he could succeed.

Mr. Miller had watched his father make good on the bargain, factory worker who provided a two-story house, a decent savings account and summer vacations to the California redwoods and Yellowstone National Park.

I MISS IT A LOT

That was the kind of life that Mr. Miller had always planned for his own family. But now there doesn't seem to be much point in even talking about it.

"Oh, yeah, I miss it a lot," he said, referring to the old job, and perhaps to the old rules.

He clings to the hope that the fortunes of T.W.A. will improve and that the company will then re-call him and others who were laid off.

One recent evening, Mr. Miller pulled out some old work tools, grasping them in hands that are now much smoother, and explained the purpose of each.

On the floor next to the sofa was a two-year-old airline magazine, with a cover article titled, "How to make good landings." On the wall, an art print carried a quote from Isaiah: "We grope for the wall like the blind."

Mr. Miller doesn't care to talk much about McDonald's. He sat in the living room with a visitor for two hours one evening, never taking off the jacket that covered his McDonald's shirt. Finally, for a brief moment, he unsnapped the buttons to reveal the uniform.

"There, you see it," he said, with a blush of embarrassment and perhaps a glint of rage. Then he closed the jacket again.

SAD STORIES AROUND

Now and then, Mr. Miller checks with some of his old buddies from the T.W.A. hangar, men who used to talk about rushing yardage and batting averages on coffee breaks. Now they share rumors about the latest threatened corporate "downsizing."

One of the men, Joe Tomczuk, could not find a job that paid more than \$6 an hour. He moved back home with his parents, at age 39, and wondered if he should abandon the hope of ever getting married and starting a family.

"Women are just like me; they want security," Mr. Tomczuk said. "What are they going to see in me?"

Another former colleague is now a janitor in a school. Others seem to have disappeared.

In the months after T.W.A. laid off several hundred workers like Mr. Miller, some marriages collapsed. Alcohol took a toll. And union officials say perhaps a dozen men peered into the bleakness of the future and committed suicide.

Mr. Miller said some friends had encouraged him to move to a city where good blue collar jobs were more plentiful. But where was that? Even at this father's old factory, in Muscatine, Iowa, a ketchup plant, technology was phasing out workers.

KEEPING UP FOR THE CHILDREN

But moving is simply not an option. The Millers' eldest child, 11-year-old Jeremiah, has several learning disabilities but has been making significant progress, which his parents credit to the top-notch teachers at the affluent Blue Valley School District. The couple will not consider risking Jeremiah's future in a mediocre school; nor are they willing to put him through the emotional strain of starting over in strange surroundings even if the schools were superior.

"We try not to tell the kids too much," Mr. Miller said. "This belongs on our shoulders, not theirs."

But some things are difficult to avoid. Not long ago, Jeremiah asked if he could take his friends to a restaurant for his birthday, a custom with many children at his school.

"We'll have to talk about that," Mr. Miller told the boy.

Mrs. Miller glanced toward the children and shook her head.

"I hope they choose their careers carefully," she said later. "Everything is geared to the college people anymore. If your job isn't sitting in front of a computer, watch out."

Mrs. Miller said she and her husband should have seen the writing on the wall. But

when times were good, they seemed like they would last forever. Now she has scant hope that those days will ever return.

"For people like us," she said, "I'm afraid the good times are gone for good."

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, my finest compliments to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and all the members on our side on the Committee on the Budget. Last year they acquitted themselves in fine fashion, coming up with facts and figures and a very credible budget. The same applies for their work product this year. That is why I rise in strong support of the budget offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], which we in the Republican leadership adopted as our official position. Once again, they provided us with a credible and complete budget proposal.

Let me give the Members the three major reasons why I support this budget. First, it is a complete one. The Democratic leadership budget makes some adjustments to the discretionary portion of the budget, but that is only one-third of the budget controlled by the appropriation process.

What about health care reform and welfare reform? The Democratic leadership tells us we will be dealing with them this year sometime. How come they are not in the budget? Not even Sherlock Holmes, Lieutenant Colombo, or the entire cast of "L.A. Law" could find a single clue in the Democratic leadership budget as to how these initiatives will be financed.

The Kasich budget, on the other hand, reflects the priorities and initiatives that we Republicans seek to further this year, and details exactly how those initiatives would be financed.

Are the Members looking for specific health care, welfare reform, and crime control proposals? They will find them in the Kasich budget.

What about reforming foreign aid or a family tax credit? They will find them in the Kasich budget.

Do they seek specific information on which lower priority programs must be reduced? They will find it in the Kasich budget.

The second major reason for supporting the Kasich budget is this: It is the only budget alternative that contains a more realistic level of defense funding. The Democratic defense figures are not sufficient to fund even their own defense program, as determined by their own Defense Department's recent Bottom-Up Review. If they will not take their own program seriously enough to fund it, then what are the rest of us supposed to be thinking?

Furthermore, the Democratic budget figures do not support a full military pay raise, as we do.

Finally, the Kasich budget provides approximately \$150 billion more in defi-

cit reduction over the next 5 years, when the Kasich budget is adopted and implemented. A real budget with real savings, is that not a refreshing idea? Compare it with a Democratic leadership budget that has as many holes in it as the New York Mets' infield.

The Kasich budget is a reality. The Democratic budget is only virtual reality. I would urge my colleagues to vote for the only real budget in town, as exemplified and reflected by the good work and handicraft of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and his colleagues on the Republican side of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Kasich substitute. This substitute is bad medicine for our health care programs. It cuts Medicare, it cuts biomedical research, it cuts immunizations, it cuts substance abuse treatment, it cuts women's health initiatives.

The substitute is designed, I want the Members to understand, to embarrass the President of the United States by enacting in this budget the Michel alternative to the health care proposal that the President has submitted to us. It would do that by putting in this bill the so-called Michel substitute, even though the bill has never been referred to the Committee on the Budget and has not yet been reported out of the committees that have jurisdiction.

However, this substitute does more than try to trick us into a health care proposal that does not provide universal coverage. The substitute would shift an additional \$30 billion in out-of-pocket costs onto Medicare beneficiaries over the next 5 years. It would cut Medicare payments to teaching hospitals by \$13.5 billion over the next 5 years.

The Kasich substitute would propose almost \$30 billion in new out-of-pocket costs on Medicare beneficiaries, and would do this by imposing coinsurance requirements for home health care and clinical lab services. It is true that some of the proposals in Medicare cuts are also in the President's bill, but look at the context. The President's bill would use some of those savings for pharmaceutical drug coverage for the elderly, for some home health care services for them as well. That is what they would get in exchange for these proposals under the President's health care reform, but in exchange for these higher cost-sharing requirements, what do Medicare beneficiaries get under the Kasich substitute? Nothing, except for higher out-of-pocket costs if they do get sick and happen to need home health care or laboratory services.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the Kasich substitute would reduce the Medicare indirect teaching adjustments from 7.7 to 3 percent, taking \$13.5 billion away

from teaching hospitals bearing the responsibility for caring for the uninsured.

Make no mistake, Mr. Chairman, a vote for this substitute is a vote against the President, a vote against the elderly, a vote against teaching hospitals, and a vote against universal coverage for health care for our people.

I urge a "no" vote on the Kasich substitute.

□ 1230

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, the very distinguished gentleman who just spoke represents the 29th District of California, and I would like him to know that under the Kasich budget his district would get \$31.1 million worth of family tax relief.

The Kasich substitute, Mr. Chairman, represents more than sound budgeting. It represents sound social policy as well.

It is high time that Congress understands that the Federal budget must be thought of in terms of people's priorities because we are spending the people's money.

A distinguishing feature between the Democrat budget and the Republican budget is simply the Republican budget says "We the people," and the Democrat budget says "We the government."

These priorities which have shaped the Kasich substitute include health care reform, welfare reform, tough and sensible crime control, incentives for job creation. It is all in there. And it is capped off with the most important proposal to emerge from the 103d Congress, a \$500-per-child tax credit that begins the process of restoring a profamily prochild tax code.

Imagine doing something explicitly for the family of America. What do they think they are, a special interest? Well, indeed they are our most important special interest, shielded and strengthened by public policy. Instead, the average American family has been a cash cow harnessed to pull the Federal gravy train.

The Kasich substitute represents a radical reversal of all of that. For the last 14 months the Congress' message to the taxpayer has been, "More for Washington, less for you."

Last year's budget blared it with higher taxes and more spending: "More for Washington, less for you."

The reconciliation bill of 1993 repeated it, and the defeat of the Penny-Kasich package of spending cuts last November locked in "More for Washington, less for you."

The same message sums up the budget fashioned last week by the House Budget Committee. It is just more for official Washington to spend, to borrow, to allocate, to redistribute, and less for the workers, the savers, the in-

vestors, the mothers and fathers of America.

We want to turn that around. We want to put families first. We want to put them at the head of the line, ahead of the bureaucrats and the grantees, the contractors, the planners, the regulators, and do not forget the consultants.

Putting families first means first and foremost letting them keep more of what they earn. It means recognizing that the people that do the most important work in this country are not Congressmen, they are mothers and fathers raising kids.

I concede the good intentions of those who really believe that the best way to help families is to expand Government services and to pay for those services by billing other families. But we have spent decades now trying to ameliorate symptoms of the decline of the family, teenage pregnancy, drug abuse, welfare dependency, to educational failure. We not only have not accomplished much in those years, but we have weakened the families even more by heavier tax burdens and more and more Government intrusion.

We have spent decades and uncounted billions trying to make Government assistance a substitute for strong family life, and it has not worked. The Kasich substitute points us in a more promising direction, letting families control more of their own resources and making more of their own decisions.

Trust the people. That is the key now, and over that long run to restoring the family as the force that holds people together, holds neighborhoods together, instills values, curbs violence, promotes health, and helps young people learn and prepares them for productive work.

We the people, not we the Government.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned about the veterans' funding under the Kasich amendment. We have examined it very closely. It seems that the bottom line for veterans' health care for 1995 under the Kasich amendment is that health care will lose \$475 million.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], on page 17 of the Republican substitute or of his amendment give us \$110 million. That is great. That is for health care, for helping process claims. But back on page 24 under the 1994 investments that were put in our legislation for veterans' health care in 1994, he eliminates that, which is around \$585 million. If you subtract the \$110 million he gave us on page 17 from the \$585 million he takes away on page 24,

the veterans come up short \$475 million.

Am I right or wrong? I just need an answer.

Mr. SABO. The gentleman is correct. My number is \$472 million. It is either \$472 million or \$475 million, but the gentleman is essentially correct, and I thank him for asking me the question.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I say to the gentleman who just spoke, I do not know whether he is aware that in the State of Illinois families that were eligible for earned income tax credits this year, which he and every Member of his party voted against in last year's reconciliation bill, numbered 599,300. That is a tax cut for working families with children already in effect, and he and every Member of his party, including the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], voted against it.

In my own State of West Virginia, 105,000 working West Virginians now are getting a tax cut as a result of the budget package that was passed and has already been implemented, and while they dangle a \$500 tax credit for children in front of people, let the RECORD show who voted against the tax relief for children of working families in the last bill.

I might add in Ohio alone, over 500,000 working families are getting a tax cut right now, working Ohioans, which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] voted against.

So I think it is important to recognize that this \$500 tax credit, which incidentally really does not apply to those under \$15,000 a year, so the sons and daughters of 50 of those in the lowest tax bracket will now be paying in years to come to the sons and daughters who enjoyed a tax bracket, those up to \$200,000 a year. That is real reform.

Then of course they do not talk about the Medicare cuts, pitting grandparents against grandchildren to pay for this.

This is a tough budget, the House budget, the Democratic budget for West Virginians, make no mistake about it. The Appalachian Regional Commission is cut.

I do not enjoy the prospect of that. There are Medicare cuts in there, agriculture offices will close, Federal employees are already being laid off, programs eliminated, frozen or cut. But in West Virginia we like the facts.

So when we hear the facts, so-called, coming from this side, let us remember the words of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] last year in August:

Come next year, we are going to find out whether we have higher deficits, we are going to find out whether we have a slower economy, we are going to find out what is

going to happen to interest rates, and it is our bet that this is a job-killer.

Here are the facts, ladies and gentlemen: Deficits are down, record deficit reduction in just 1 year with the passage of that bill. Unemployment is up. So much for the job-killer. It was a job-gainer. And finally, when looking at the facts, economic growth is at a record peak, 3.2 percent in 1 year, which exceeds 4 years of the previous years.

These are the folks who just a few moments ago told you to vote for this as a job-killer. Take that into consideration when voting.

The House budget is the one that continues the progress that we are on. The Kasich budget is from the same folks who voted unanimously against the package that put us back on track.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I want the people of the Second District of West Virginia to know that there are 113,085 children that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE], does not feel ought to get the tax credit to the tune of over \$56 million.

I would say to the gentleman, just keep banking on raising people's taxes and raising Federal spending and defending the pork-barrel politics of the leaders of your State, and you will find yourself with a slower economy.

□ 1240

In addition to the arguments that have been made here, Medicare and Medicaid, under the Kasich substitute, Medicare increases by \$87 billion; Medicare increases by \$87 billion under our plan. Medicaid is \$63 billion.

The Clinton plan, of course, makes \$130 billion worth of Medicare cuts.

So I would warn my friends to be very careful of that, and furthermore, the Veterans' Administration gets funded at the same level under the Republican plan as under the Democrat plan. We get more for veterans and less for bureaucracy. We have the numbers for the gentleman from West Virginia to show you the raw numbers.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich budget.

It supports economic growth, it cuts the deficit \$150 billion more than President Clinton's and provides real tax relief for the American family.

During the last 40 years, the Federal income tax burden for a family of four has increased by 250 percent as a share of family income. Today, most American families pay more in Federal taxes than they pay for food, clothing, transportation, insurance and recreation combined. That's tragic.

A recent poll reveals Americans favor family tax relief 3 to 1, even if it means cuts in entitlements.

The Kasich budget provides a \$500 per child family tax credit—for three children that would be \$1,500 more in purchasing power. Ninety percent of this relief goes to families making less than \$75,000 a year.

The family is the first and best Department of Education;

The first and best Department of Health and Human Services;

The first and best Department of Housing;

And the first and best Department of Energy and Transportation.

There is no instrument of economic growth, savings, and job training as effective as the middle class family.

It is the repository of values.

It is the sustainer of society.

And our Government has chiseled away at its foundation for 40 years.

The question that confronts us is this: Is our faith in the big brother of big Government, or is our faith in the moms and dads of America?

The mantra of the Beltway is: The Government giveth and the Government taketh away. Blessed be the hand of big Government.

The Kasich budget says, "No more." It strikes a blow for the most neglected special interest in America—the family.

For once, let us forget party loyalty and party discipline.

For once, let us forget the marching orders and let us do right for the family.

Let us return over \$20 billion per year to the families of 50 million American children.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, today we are debating the Republican alternative to the budget resolution, and we are being more or less sidetracked on an issue with respect to tax credits.

It is important to remember that the Democratic bill that passed last August provided the largest tax break to ordinary working families in this decade, so do not be fooled by the talk about the tax credit that is contained in the Republican alternative. What we must remember is what they are doing to the budget. The so-called appeal to family is entirely decimated in the Republican alternative. It is bad for the children, it is bad for the families, it destroys the underpinning of educational and job training support that we have had as a tradition and as a policy in programs that have been enacted in the past by the Congress.

The Kasich substitute decimates the investment policy and priorities of the Clinton administration. The Kasich substitute cuts \$1.9 billion from the committee resolution in the area of education, training, and social services which over a 5-year period will amount to \$53 billion. It cuts \$1.1 billion from

our investment in Head Start. Everybody says they are for Head Start. His substitute cuts this program and reduces the investment in our young people. It completely exacerbates support for child care programs by consolidating them and not providing the kind of focus and priority which is needed. It consolidates all the hunger and nutrition programs that have been the real bulwark of our support for poor people, and food stamps, school lunches and school breakfast programs; it cuts about 5 percent of that funding for schoolchildren supported by impact aid. It completely wipes out this program and eliminates it in 5 years.

Do not be fooled by the Kasich substitute.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

In the explanation just given by the gentlewoman from Hawaii, you have heard precisely, precisely the difference between the two budgets you have before you today.

The gentlewoman from Hawaii just told you about all of the Government programs that the Kasich budget would cut. She is absolutely right. Programs would be cut. People would be helped.

That is the big difference. We are attempting to help people, real working families people, middle-class people; 134,000 kids in the gentlewoman's district would be eligible for this tax credit, \$67.1 million of family tax relief would go to her district in Hawaii under the Kasich budget.

That is the big difference here.

They want to talk about all of the good Government programs that they want the money to go to, bigger and bigger Government, more and more bureaucrats doing things supposedly to help America.

We want to talk about helping America by giving people tax relief, by giving people the ability to help themselves. That is the big difference here.

There is a major difference between these two approaches: More and more big Government on behalf of the Democrat budget; the Kasich budget, the Republican budget, talks about helping people for real, helping families for real.

And how do we do that? Not just with the tax relief. We help them because we put in health care reform. We help them because we put in welfare reform. We have crime reform in here.

Families are being devastated on the streets of America. Mothers cannot walk across the parking lots at shopping centers because they fear the crime going on in this country. We fund the crime bill in our bill.

And the bottom line is we also protect the kids better in the future, because we put \$150 billion more in defi-

cit cuts in the Kasich budget than are in the Democrat big-Government budget.

We do what is necessary to help middle-class families for real. People are helped by the Kasich budget. People are undermined by more and more big Government and by the refusal to deal with reform in the Democrat budget.

Vote for Kasich.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Kasich substitute. I think it is a sound and responsible piece of legislation.

Last year, we had a clear choice of visions for the Government's role in our society. Republicans, ably led by JOHN KASICH, offered a budget proposal to achieve greater deficit reduction entirely through spending cuts. This plan was unfortunately defeated on a party-line vote. President Clinton and his Democrat allies in Congress, instead, shepherded through Congress the largest tax increase in U.S. history, with few—if any—spending cuts.

Once again this year, we have a clear set of choices. The Republican members of the Budget Committee have drafted a proposal to reduce the budget deficit by \$150 billion through specific reductions in Government spending, provide necessary funding for defense, reform our welfare and health care systems, enact a tough anticrime package, provide families with a \$500-per-child tax credit, and index capital gains for inflation.

The Kasich budget also provides for real reform of the Government by contracting out for services which could be more efficiently provided by the private sector, combining programs into block grants to enable States and localities to determine how best to provide the actual services, and ending duplication of Government services. The Kasich budget calls for real change and real deficit reduction. I commend the Republican Members and staff of the Budget Committee for their hard work, and urge Members to vote for the Kasich alternative.

□ 1250

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think everyone should be aware that the gentleman from the Third District of Oregon, who just spoke, ought to be aware that the Republican budget provides \$56.9 million of family tax relief for 113,746 children in his district. That is what we are talking about.

You know, as I moved around the floor the last couple of days, I talked to one Member in particular of this House about the family tax relief. His response to me was very clear about the big difference here. He says, "We can't afford to give families, to give families tax relief," as if he owned the money.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman. Mr. KASICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Also, at the same time, giving families tax relief, we are also providing for growth in Head Start. I ask the gentleman, is that correct?

Mr. DELAY. Absolutely. And that is an excellent point. The point I am trying to make is: "Give the families tax money"? What we are talking about is allowing them to keep the money to raise their families. This is a big distinction here. The gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] in his excellent presentation in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget, made a very poignant argument when he said, "If you want to build a nation, you go read the budget of that nation." That is what we are being presented with here.

Mr. Chairman, I have the utmost respect for the Black Caucus because they are being true to the American people about their vision of America and what kind of Government they would have. I do not agree with it, but at least they are being honest about it.

We are being honest about it also with the Kasich budget. We are showing you what we would do if the Republicans were in charge of this House and in charge of the Senate. It would be a much different America, it would be a much different Government.

The Sabo budget is showing politics and business as usual; more Government, keep the Government's money so that they do not have to give it to families in tax relief.

If you are serious about reforming health care and paying for it without passing on more debt to our children, vote for Kasich and oppose Sabo. If you are serious about overhauling the welfare system and paying for it without passing on more debt to our children, vote for Kasich and oppose Sabo.

If you are serious about locking up criminals and making our streets safe and paying for it without passing on more debt to our children, vote for Kasich and oppose Sabo.

If you are really serious about ensuring our national security with a strong defense and paying for it without passing on more debt to our children, vote for Kasich and oppose Sabo.

If you are really serious about tax relief to families, allowing families to keep their own money with a \$500-per-child tax relief credit and paying for it without passing on more debt to our children, vote for Kasich but oppose Sabo.

Mr. SABO. I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me and for the superb job that he has done in crafting this serious, solid budget resolution.

In response to the three previous speakers on the other side, I would say

that if they are serious about tax relief for families, they would have voted last year for the reconciliation bill, the earned income tax credit. In the State of Arkansas, that would have benefited 202,800 families; State of Pennsylvania, 510,100 families; State of Texas, 1,441,000 families would have benefited from the earned income tax credit, which they voted against in the reconciliation bill.

Most of those same families will not get the tax credit proposed in the Kasich bill because it is not refundable.

I want to address myself to what I consider a very serious, what I consider a dangerous-to-safety proposal in the Kasich budget plan: to totally privatize the Air Traffic Control Corporation. As they claim, it will reduce the budget deficit. But it will do so by taking air traffic control expenses out of the budget while not making a full offsetting reduction in taxes. The proposal would increase user fee costs by 65 percent, some \$2.5 billion per year. Airlines would still have to pay a 6-percent ticket tax to support the rump FAA.

In addition, airlines would also have to pay new fees to cover the costs of the Air Traffic Control Corporation. We have done a careful analysis of this in my subcommittee, and we estimate these fees to be the equivalent of an additional 10.5-percent tax. Take a close look, airlines and air travelers, passenger payments would be the equivalent of a tax of 16.5 percent compared to today's 10-percent airline ticket tax.

These are costs that would be borne directly by the traveling public in the form of higher airline ticket prices. They will be paying twice.

What this means, very simply, is this little feat of budgetary legerdemain and its cousin, the administration's corporate privatizing scheme, will sock the airline industry and air travelers at a time when that industry has lost \$11 billion over the past years. This proposal is bad safety policy and worse budget policy.

Mr. KASICH. I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS].

Mr. GRAMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. GRAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do not know where the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] quotes his numbers from. He must be reading his own budget or something. But we do not raise the ticket tax. In fact, we lower the ticket tax. They have a higher ticket tax.

Second, our proposal does not impact on safety. Our proposal is designed to privatize the air traffic control of this, and if the gentleman read the Washing-

ton Post last Friday, he would see what a terrible shape we are in with respect to the technology.

Mr. GRAMS. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. Chairman, everyone should be aware that for the previous speaker's district, Mr. OBERSTAR's 8th District of Minnesota, the Republican budget provides \$61.4 million of family tax relief for 122,815 children.

Mr. Chairman, in a few minutes, every Member of this House will have to make a fundamental decision between supporting bigger Government or stronger families. The vote on the Kasich substitute will tell the American people whose side you're on.

I believe families are the most basic and effective form of Government. Families are the first Department of Education, Health and Human Services, Housing, and Transportation. Whatever Government can do for children, strong families can do better.

But Government interference has made it more difficult for families to make it on their own. Higher taxes, overregulation, and Federal mandates have resulted in poorer families. And who has benefitted most from the impoverishment of the American family? Big government and the Bureaucrats who live off it. The Democrats talk about their tax credit, but not their record tax increase. By giving families a \$500-per-child tax credit and using specific cuts in Federal spending to pay for it, the Kasich substitute offers us an opportunity to right these wrongs. It takes power away from those who run the Government and returns it to those who pay for the Government. It finally gives a voice to those families who have worked hard, paid their taxes, and watched Government grow at their expense for so many years.

Yet, some in this body complain that the family tax credit is unfair—that low- and middle-income Americans lose out. They're wrong.

Fully 75 percent of the tax relief in this package goes to those making less than \$60,000 a year. And those are the folks who are getting squeezed—the ones who are not rich enough to hire tax lawyers—who are not poor enough to get Government benefits. The middle class.

The Kasich substitute is not simply a Republican budget—it's an American budget—an American family budget. It's the budget Clinton promised the American people in 1992, the one he could have—and should have—introduced this year, and the one his political advisers will tell him to propose next year.

But now, my colleagues, it is time to find out whose side you are on?

Make the right choice—choose American families. Vote for the Kasich substitute. American families will be voting on your performance in November.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

The proposal before us has been promoted as family-friendly and fiscally responsible. Let us focus on just one provision that puts the lie to those claims.

This proposal would charge market rates for the power supplied by three of the Federal Government's power marketing administrations. Republicans estimate that charging these rates would increase revenues by \$1.2 billion a year beginning in 1996. Sounds great.

The problem is that \$1.2 billion in electric rate increases, not a penny to the Federal Government because you do not change the term of the repayment. You will raise the electric rates. But the money will rest with those utilities, those power marketing administrations.

Beyond that, there would be a net loss to the Treasury. We have electric rates of 25 to 60 percent across 13 Western States, which would trigger a series of business collapses, job losses, and all to make the deficit look better on paper; for millions of ratepayers, workers, and small business owners in the States of California, Colorado, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and Arkansas.

□ 1300

Mr. Chairman, I say, if your Representative comes from one of those States, if you live in one of those States, there is nothing family friendly about this proposal because your electric bill is going to go up more than the tiny amount of tax relief that's being falsely promised to you in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is not family friendly. It is antibusiness. It is antiworker. It is antifamily. And it is not even fiscally responsible because it will not reduce the deficit except on paper or provide revenues to the Federal Government except on paper by one penny.

Vote "no."

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the point that what we do with power marketing is decide that the whole rest of the country should not be subsidizing the operation of these units out in some parts of the West.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for yielding this time to me, and I would just want to let my friend, the

gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO], know that 114,544 children would be eligible for the tax credit under the Kasich budget, and I know he will have some energetic conversations with the families of some of those kids.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Eligible to pay more bills—

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

My colleagues, a lot of people have driven around this country, literally millions of them, with bumper strips that say, "I support our troops." Well, the American people support our troops rhetorically. They have given them moral support. They send their young men and women to serve in the Armed Forces. But only this House, this Congress, can support our troops with the defense budget.

Mr. Chairman, the Democrat budget hollows America's defenses, and it threatens to return us to the days of the 1970's when 50 percent of our aircraft were not fully mission capable, when we had a thousand petty officers a month getting out of the Navy because they could not make it any longer, when we had large numbers of our young men and women on food stamps, and let me commend to everyone the McCain report entitled, "Going Hollow," because I think it prints the pathway that the Democrat program and the Democrat budget is following. We are hollowing our forces with the Democrat budget in terms of readiness, in terms of modernization.

And for those who say we are at peace, Mr. Chairman, let me just remind my Democrat friends that we have now carried on an airlift in Bosnia longer than the Berlin airlift. We have now flown more sorties over Iraq since Desert Storm than during Desert Storm. Keeping the peace is expensive.

I would say to all of my friends, all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, "Support our troops. Support your freedom. Support the Kasich budget."

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KREIDLER].

Mr. KREIDLER. Mr. Chairman, the Kasich substitute is like a hot fudge sundae—rich, tempting, and full of empty calories. It is wrapped in an awful pretty package, but there is nothing but trouble inside.

Sure, I would like to give every family \$500 per child—who wouldn't? But what those who support Mr. KASICH's proposal don't tell you is that his bill raises electric bills more than that in the Northwest.

Yesterday, on the Solomon substitute, we had an intellectually honest opportunity to level with the American people—to show them the true shape of a balanced budget.

Well, we failed. And here they go again, playing the same old shell game.

I say to parents in the Pacific Northwest—the tax credit is just an illusion. What we

need—and what will truly help your family budget—is a steady reduction in the Federal deficit so interest rates stay low and we keep creating new jobs.

I am going to pass up this hot fudge sundae. I urge my colleagues to do the same and vote no.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, let the last speaker, the gentlemen from California [Mr. HUNTER], know that in his State 2,146,900 families are eligible for the earned income tax credit which his side voted against last year.

Mr. Chairman, the Kasich priorities are clear. This budget lives in a time warp. It adds more to deficit reduction at a time when the deficit is being dramatically reduced. It adds more to defense at a time when the cold war is over and the United States is the only military power in the world. And what and where does it cut? It cuts increases that were modest indeed, that fund domestic programs that have been on a starvation diet: Head Start, educational reform, dislocated worker training, compensatory education, infrastructure, mass transit, and many others.

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] missed one. There is no cut in private contractors while career civil servants are facing layoffs. We could actually find modest raises for our career people if we cut personnel services for private contractors.

How are we going to reinvent government by laying off some people and denying the rest raises? From the private sector we have borrowed the notion of buyouts, if we can just get them passed and to conference. But there, Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues: "You do buyouts so that you can give regular increases for those who remain to make your business more efficient."

We should be cutting private contracting no matter what we do with the savings. It is wrong to cut the workers we can see while giving a free ride to the shadow government.

We cannot strip the country down any further, in its domestic programs, Mr. Chairman. They are close to the bones. That is why we made modest investments on the domestic side last year.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the conference chairman of the House Republicans.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the point that we give a larger cost-of-living increase to Federal employees than the administration does, so if my colleagues are wor-

ried about that, they should vote for us.

Second, of course we do reduce private consultants in our overhead reduction, and I appreciate the gentleman having yielded to me.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I think everybody should be aware that for the previous speaker's district, the city of Washington, DC, in the Republican budget we provide \$41.8 million of family tax relief which covers 83,637 children.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and the other Republicans on the Committee on the Budget for assembling the best budget I have seen in my 9 years in Washington.

This Kasich budget is much more than a budget. It is the Republican agenda. It is a blueprint that illustrates how Republicans will govern when we are the majority.

Our initiative expands individual freedom and economic opportunity, while limiting the size and reach of the Federal Government. Reducing the Washington bureaucracy allows us to cut taxes for American families, offer incentives for growth in the private sector of the economy, and reduce the deficit \$150 billion more than the Democrat budget.

In our proposal, we provide families with a tax credit of \$500 per child, leaving more income and discretion in the hands of ordinary people and less in the hands of politicians and bureaucrats. We encourage saving and investment, which will lead to more jobs and higher take home pay. Republicans believe in the ability of the American people to create the jobs of tomorrow and reject the notion that higher living standards come from a bloated public sector.

In our welfare bill, which we pay for in our budget, work and families are rewarded—ending the perverse incentives in the current welfare system. Our health reform bill, which we pay for, protects the sovereignty of the health consumer. We leave health care decisions to ordinary Americans and their doctors, not to a national health board. In our budget, Republicans put more police on the beat, require tough sentencing for violent criminals, and build more prisons, and we pay for it.

More income for families, less for Washington. More investment and jobs in the private sector of the economy. Reinventing and reducing Government. Welfare and health reform. A tough crime bill. And greater deficit reduction.

This is our Republican agenda for freedom. I urge my colleagues to support the Kasich amendment and, Mr. Chairman, let me just add that it has been amazing to me to watch, after the American people have made it so very clear to us that they want cuts in spending and reductions in taxes, to hear all the bleeding, and moaning, and

groaning, that has come from the other side of the aisle in light of the only honest effort to cut spending and reinvent Government. The fact that they have only been able to reply by citing their adoption of the Republican idea to give families the earned income tax credit shows us once again that it is much better to go with the original than those who copy us.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my hard working, dedicated colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Kasich budget, but I do so with compliments to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], for his diligence in putting together a responsible alternative. JOHN KASICH has been one of those Republicans who has on many occasions been willing to reach across the aisle and work with Democrats for a real solution to our deficit problem. Last fall he was willing to step forward and engage in a process that led to the development of a plan to cut spending by \$90 billion over 5 years.

□ 1310

Bipartisan support was registered for that effort, and I was proud to stand with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] in making that fight for fiscal responsibility. Our differences today are not because of any fundamental disagreement about the need for bipartisanship to solve this budget problem once and for all, and it is not because I believe that this budget as presented by the gentleman from Ohio is an irresponsible budget. The difference simply stems from the focus of this budget alternative, and in my judgment it does not focus enough on deficit reduction.

It does include 150 billion dollars' worth of deficit reductions over 5 years, but we have a much larger problem than that will solve. It falls short because of a \$60 billion add-back for the Pentagon which we cannot afford and should not adopt. It falls short because it promises over \$100 billion of tax cuts for American families, which may sound good but does not represent responsible tax policy in the face of a \$200 billion deficit.

Mr. Chairman, we need deficit reduction first. This budget alternative does not focus enough on that important goal, and it is for that reason that I must oppose the plan.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, this time we have a new mantra as we get the March of the Siamese Children on the other side.

Each one is programmed to say his little piece when he comes in. This year it is about the tax cuts.

That is probably because they want to forget last year's mantra. Last year they were all programmed to come up and tell us how many jobs we would each lose in our districts if we voted for the budget. In fact, that prediction has turned out to be totally and completely wrong, so that all the Republican Members who marched up very carefully and recited what they were told to recite about job loss would like us to forget the unremittingly inaccurate predictions they made about last year's budget.

We now have in this budget confirmation that one of the great stage plays of all time will take place here shortly when many of the Members on the other side vote for the balanced budget constitutional amendment, because that, I believe, calls for the budget to be balanced by 2001.

Here is the budget presented officially by the Republican Party. Five years from now they call for a deficit of \$172.2 billion. There deficit 5 years from now will be up from the deficit this year, but then they would have us believe next week that right after they present us a budget in which in 1999 their deficit will be \$172.2 billion, up from what it was this coming year, they are going to balance the budget in 2 years and abolish that altogether.

So let us think when we evaluate their rhetoric about the predictions last year of the gentleman from Texas, who told us the budget bill would be a job cutter or the gentleman from Ohio, who said it would put the economy into the gutter. These are people who spent all last year walking around with signs saying that the world is going to end Tuesday. It is now Wednesday afternoon and the sun is shining, and they are a little distressed.

I say to the Members, remember when you hear their mantra how inaccurate last year's was, and remember when you hear them talk about the balanced budget, by their own admission, 2 years before their balanced budget is to take effect, they will not even be close to the goal they are going to profess so piously next week to be supporting.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that last year we were given a challenge by the President. The President said, "If you don't like our tax-and-spend bill"—and, by the way, the only reason you have any earned income tax credit in your bill is to try to offset the tax increases on working poor people in this country—"give us your specifics." And, of course, we did, and we did better than you did in terms of reducing the deficit.

Let me say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that I think this

debate is perfect, because if my friends in the Democrat Party think that higher taxes, more Government spending, more regulation, and that putting the power of Washington bureaucrats over the power of the American family is the way to go, I will tell them that they are wrong and we will be back on this floor again. And I would suggest to my colleagues, "Don't count your chickens before they hatch in terms of investing in Government as the answer for our country."

This year we did much better. The President delivered a wonderful speech up here in which he talked about welfare reform and health care and a crime bill. Then he sent us the budget, and did he have welfare reform on it? Of course not. Did he give us a crime bill? Of course not. He withdrew his health care bill because the health care bill sends the deficit through the roof. But the President promised us all the way back in the Democrat debates that the middle income Americans would get tax relief, and that any economic program would give hardworking American families some tax fairness.

I say to the Members. You didn't give us the crime bill and you didn't give us the welfare bill and you didn't give us the health bill, and you haven't given us the middle income tax relief, so we decided we needed to keep the promises that they made. In the Republican bill we do have health care, with a down payment, beginning to solve the problem, not by turning health care over to the Federal Government but by using the private sector.

We have a welfare reform bill that I trust the Members will believe the American people will support which gives training and imposes some discipline. And, of course, we also have more money in our crime bill for more prisons and more police on the street, and lo and behold, not only growth incentives, all of which are paid for, but we have delivered on the middle income tax cut the President has been promising.

Imitation is the highest form of flattery, and I think this President will come in with tax relief for middle income families because middle income families want him to keep his word, and they believe that as the Government of the United States begins to be downsized, when we finally accept the principle that Washington is not as important as the heartland across this country, they believe that Americans should share in the benefits of reducing the Government.

The bottom line on this proposal is simple. We have included all these programs, including trying to help the besieged American family, and in the course of doing it we have cut deficits by \$150 billion more than the Clinton plan. And I say to my colleagues who say they do not think the American family ought to get any of their money

back because our deficit cuts are not deep enough, that they cannot vote for the Clinton plan because our budget is \$150 billion more in greater deficit reduction, 5 out of 5 years better.

Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is that we should support the Republican proposal that says we should have less for Washington and more for the American family, and that is what the American people want.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

□ 1320

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Kasich substitute to the House budget resolution. I believe it would be a painful step backward—at a time when we must keep moving forward.

One year ago, in this very Chamber, when we passed President Clinton's first budget, we voted for fiscal responsibility—for fiscal sanity.

We said we had to start making the tough choices—reining in the runaway spending and borrowing, the lop-sided policies that favored the rich over middle-class America—policies that had been a proud Republican legacy.

We said it was time for the wealthiest handful of Americans to pay their fair share—instead of soaking up huge tax cuts while hard-working American families watched their paychecks grow smaller and smaller.

We said it was time for basic fairness—fairness to the families that sent us here in the first place.

Fairness to the families who know that, for all the Republican rhetoric about "big government" and "tax and spend," Democrats have been fighting for them for decades. And for a dozen years of Reagan and Bush, it was clearly an uphill battle.

Today, we can choose to continue down that path of fairness and fiscal responsibility. A path that has brought more new jobs, and higher economic growth, than in all the Bush years. A path that has brought a lower deficit, and lower interest rates—lower than we have seen in years. A path that has brought more new homes, more family investment, and more consumer confidence, than we've seen in a long, long time.

We can keep traveling down this path. Or we can vote for the Kasich substitute. We can vote for Congressman KASICH's slap-dash package of cuts in crucial programs, and deep tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans.

I believe that would be a grave mistake—and we would pay the price for decades.

We would pay the price for significantly reducing biomedical research, child immunizations, drug treatment, and AIDS funding.

We would pay the price for gouging a whopping \$45 million out of Medicare.

We would pay the price for deep cuts in medical care for veterans—and the outright elimination of legal aid for those too poor to hire their own lawyer.

And for all these catastrophic cuts, you would think that Congressman KASICH would at least propose some measure of tax fairness, tax relief, for American families.

But in fact, his tax proposals are regressive, unfair, and downright dangerous to our working people.

He wants a capital gains tax cut for the wealthy. He wants big tax breaks for big business.

His highly trumpeted child tax credit would go to many of the richest Americans, and would not even apply to the families who need it most—those earning less than \$16,000 a year.

So let us make it clear that we have had enough of the rusted Reaganomics that hurt us so badly in the 1980's.

Let us make it clear that, now that we have a budget that works for America's middle-class families, we are not going to turn back the hands of time.

And let us reject the Kasich substitute budget—before it has a chance to wreck our economy, and our society, and be unfair to the hard working middle income American families.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the Republican whip.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from Ohio for allowing me this opportunity. Let me say that it is a delight to follow the very distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], who is such an eloquent advocate of his side.

We have one difference of opinion I think about the direction of the country, and another difference of potentially fact about where our tax benefits go. So I just want to make very clear to everybody, first of all, I am very, very grateful to all allowed to serve with JOHN KASICH and the team he has put together on the Committee on the Budget, because these Members, as the Washington Post, hardly a Republican bastion, has said, they have produced a budget that adds up. You may not agree with their direction, and certainly Members who are too liberal to vote for this, Members who believe in big Government, Members who want to sustain the welfare state, will not want to vote for the Kasich budget, because it represents a basic change in where America is going. And I respect that.

That is a difference of opinion about America's future. And those who believe that the welfare state has worked in Washington DC, that the murders we see every night are just a random accident, that the President was wrong when he came during the State of the

Union and said beginning 30 years ago families began to decline, a date which is in fact the Great Society, according to President Clinton's own words in the State of the Union.

Those who think President Clinton was wrong to say we must strengthen families, I can appreciate that in order to protect the welfare state they are going to vote no on the Kasich budget.

But I want to make two points of fact. The \$500 per family tax credit for children is, in fact, going to help working American families. This chart shows it clearly. Ninety percent of the money will go to families under \$75,000. Ninety percent. That is the families where people get up every morning and go to work, often both the husband and the wife, and sometimes it is a single head of household, and they go to work. And the taxes that over the years the Democrats have raised again and again and again leave them with tragically less money than they would have had under Harry Truman.

What we do in this Republican budget, for the first time, is begin to give families the money to take care of their children, for a very profound difference of opinion.

Our good friends who wanted to maintain the welfare state believe that bureaucrats love your children more than parents. They believe that bureaucrats are smarter about raising children than parents. They want to take the money out of that family, transfer it through Washington, and hire a bureaucrat to reach into that family, so the bureaucrat can do what the parents cannot, because the parents do not have the money. If you are a family of three children, that is \$1,500 in your pocket, to help you raise your child, to help you save for college, to help you buy clothing. Fifteen hundred dollars may not be much if you are very, very wealthy. But it is a lot if you are a working family or if you are a single mother trying to raise those three children.

Second, we do not have a capital gains tax cut in the traditional sense. We do one thing. We index capital investments against inflation. We say to you if you buy a family farm, over the next 30 years you should not be cheated by your Government with inflation. If you save, you should not be cheated by your Government with inflation. If you have a little investment or you start a small business, and you happen to have that business grow for 10, 15, or 20 years, you should not be cheated by your Government through inflation.

Now, the Democrats I understand may favor inflation. The Democrats may want to in fact push that family farm into a higher tax bracket. They may want to push that small business into a higher tax bracket. We think it is only fair to people willing to save to let them keep the money, instead of having the Government take it away.

But what it comes down to is something very simple: We believe that Government is too big and it spends too much. We believe that Washington has too much of your money, and when you realize that over the next 5 years it will have over \$9 trillion to spend, we think cutting the deficit deeper, which the Kasich budget does, we think cutting taxes for families, which the Kasich budget does, we believe that returning power back home by having an unfunded mandate provision, to send power back to the counties, cities, and States, which the Kasich budget does, we think these are the right steps, because we think America is healthier when Americans get to keep their own money.

Our good friends in the Democrat leadership who believe in the welfare state, who believe that this whole structure of public housing and public relief and all these things which are destroying the country work, let me just say to you, you cannot maintain this civilization with 12-year-olds having babies, with 15-year-olds killing each other, with 17-year-olds dying of AIDS, and 18-year-olds getting diplomas they cannot read.

The Kasich budget begins to move us away from that system. The Kasich budget begins to return money back to families so they can raise their children in a decent environment and have a chance to do something about their education and give them a better future.

The Democratic leadership will presently ask you to vote for more of the same tired welfare state spending, and I just ask you, look at the murder in Washington in that high school, look at what is happening in this Nation's Capital, look at the death and devastation the welfare state has wrought, and vote for a change. Vote to help families. Vote for the Kasich budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

□ 1330

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, we are at the end of this debate and virtually at the end of this bill. I would say this has been a good debate, a useful debate, and I think, largely, a helpful one. But we now have to make the choice between a number of alternative budgets.

The immediate choice is to decide whether to pass the Kasich budget. I want to salute the gentleman from Ohio. I think he is one of our talented and able Members, and I think he has made a positive contribution to this debate, both with this substitute and with his own exceptional efforts.

But I cannot agree with him, nor with the distinguished Republican whip, that this is the wiser course for us to take, or that the Sabo budget represents an endorsement of some mythical welfare state.

It is not a welfare state that provides for basic nutrition for nursing mothers in WIC; or provides for educational benefits for our children in school; or deals with the problems of our senior citizens in Medicare; or provides student loan opportunities for students to prepare for their responsibilities in work and citizenship. None of these things that this Sabo bill provides, and the Kasich bill cuts would, I think, raise any serious question among the American people. The Sabo budget is a sound, responsible, effective budget, and it is a budget that is reducing the deficit.

I do not want to go over what has been mentioned before, but last year we heard terrible predictions of what would happen if the Democratic leadership budget was adopted. We had Members on the other side saying that we would have a recession, that the country would see huge increases in unemployment levels, and the collapse of the economy.

Instead, we have an economy that the Chairman of the Federal Reserve described recently as underlyingly more healthy and promising than at any time in the last two or three decades—two or three decades.

And we have an economy which is producing lower interest rates, providing greater investment levels, and greater employment levels than in many, many years.

I am not going to go into the specifics of the Kasich amendment. I think we have talked about that already.

But it does strike me as exceedingly strange, if we are interested in helping children, as the gentleman from Georgia keeps saying, and we are interested in being fair to the American people, that this amendment provides tax credits for people who earn \$200,000 a year and more, and denies them to families who earn under \$16,000. If that represents fairness to American families to my colleagues on the other side, then I am perplexed.

We have a chance to continue to build on last year's great and important budget decision, a decision which is reducing our deficit and building a healthy and strong economy, which is providing the jobs, investment, and growth that we want for the immediate future and beyond.

We can take great pride, every Member of this House who voted for the Democratic budget last year. We can, indeed, welcome the opportunity that our friends on the other side offered us, to stand up and say, this year, "We were right last year; you were wrong last year."

We can be right again this year by voting for the Sabo budget and against the Kasich budget.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Kasich budget substitute amendment. My Republican colleagues on the Budget Committee have crafted a

budget proposal that contains over 250 real spending cuts and real reforms in how the Federal Government works. These recommendations would reduce the deficit by \$152 billion more than the Democrat resolution.

In contrast to the Democrat budget, which continues the trend of high taxes, high spending, and high deficits, the Republican budget alternative offers a real choice to the American people.

The Democrat budget fails to address the issues of family tax relief, welfare reform, crime reform, health care reform, and job creation incentives. The Kasich budget includes provisions dealing with all these issues, and still achieves more deficit reduction than the Democrat budget.

The Kasich budget plan provides a \$500 tax credit for each child in a family earning less than \$200,000 a year. The 16th Congressional District of Illinois contains 138,310 children. That means that the 16th District would receive \$69,155,000 in tax relief. Nationally, 86 percent of the tax credit would go to families with a gross annual income below \$75,000 per year. For the taxpayers in the 16th District, and across the Nation, this is well-deserved break.

In 1992, while running for President, then-Governor Bill Clinton supported a middle-class tax cut. But as President, Bill Clinton reneged on that promise. His excuse was that faced with an unexpectedly high budget deficit, we simply could not afford it. Well, by his administration's own updated numbers, the budget deficit has shrunk to \$176 billion. The excuse of a high deficit is no longer valid.

Lawmakers who oppose tax cuts paid for by spending reductions usually rely on taxpayers' ignorance of who actually gains from such spending. Federal programs primarily benefit small and powerful interest groups at the expense of all taxpayers. But the Kasich budget reverses this trend. It benefits millions of American families at the expense of a few Washington interest groups by cutting many unneeded Federal programs.

The Kasich plan also includes the House Republican welfare reform proposal which stresses work instead of welfare, and seeks to put people on payrolls instead of public assistance rolls. It combats crime by including \$2 billion for additional local police officers and \$3 billion to fund Federal-State partnerships for new prisons. The Kasich budget also fully funds the Affordable Health Care Now Act, which expands access to health coverage while containing costs and assures that medical decisions remain in the hands of patients and doctors, not government bureaucrats.

But it also includes job creation and economic growth incentives. The Republican budget makes changes in the Tax Code to boost economic growth by encouraging higher levels of saving, investing, and risk taking. Specifically, it indexes capital gains, establishes a deduction for capital losses on the sale of a primary residence, makes IRA's fully deductible, allows expensing of business equipment, and extends the research and development tax credit.

I don't agree with every spending cut in the Kasich plan, but that should not detract from the overall goal of this well-drafted budget al-

ternative that addresses the needs of what the American people have been saying over the last year—cut spending first and make government more responsive to its owners: the taxpayers.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, the question before us today is quite simple—should we keep more money in the hands of Americans back home or should we have them send it to Washington so that Congress can decide how to spend it?

The Kasich alternative to the President's budget for fiscal year 1995 reverses the trend that we have seen since World War II, in which a growing percentage of family income gets taxed and spent by the Government.

Mr. KASICH's budget goes well beyond not raising taxes. It changes the way the Government does business. It offers reforms to control spending now and in the long run. It not only brings down the Federal deficit by \$310 billion over the next 5 years—\$152 billion more than the President's budget would—it provides mechanisms to help ensure that spending not only goes down now, but stays down in the future.

It recognizes that the financial and regulatory burdens placed on small businesses by government have been creating disincentives for employers to create jobs. The Kasich budget offers creative changes to encourage savings and investment.

Unwilling to merely maintain the status quo in such areas as welfare, crime, and health care, Mr. KASICH includes in his amendment creative new approaches to each of these critical national issues.

Unwilling to just keep business as usual in such areas as job training and counseling, the Kasich budget takes 80 separate Federal Government job training programs—each with their own bureaucracies—and consolidates them into seven block grants. These grants would then be given to States, whose Governors and legislatures know how best to utilize these funds. In addition, by eliminating program overlap and by better targeting our resources in this way, we're able to save close to \$2 billion and use it to bring down the deficit.

Thus, we have the opportunity today to say "no" to the status quo and "no" to the proposition that Washington's answer to our problems is more government. We also have the opportunity today to say "yes" to reforming government, "yes" to changing the way we do business, and "yes" to making real progress at bringing the Federal budget and deficit under control. We also can go home to our constituents and tell them that the Government's answer to our Nation's ills is less government and more reliance on the individual citizen and the private sector.

Let's answer the question posed to us today by voting for the Kasich budget alternative.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, House Budget Committee Republicans have a budget that encompasses four major issues facing our country: health care reform, crime, welfare reform, and deficit reduction. It also contains tax relief for American families suffering from successive tax increases over the past several years. I am proud to associate myself with this visionary budget. I hope that one day soon a budget similar to the Kasich

GOP budget will be the last to pass under the King of the Hill procedure employed by the Democrats again this year to ensure passage of their lackluster budget resolution.

By including full funding for the Affordable Health Care Now Act, the Republican welfare reform proposal, and a down payment on the Crime Control Act, this budget responds directly to these crucial issues. The President's budget includes funds for only one-half of the new police officers he has promised. The President fails to include funds for welfare reform altogether. On health care, the President excludes from the budget at least \$1.4 trillion in health care spending he has proposed over the next 5 years, including in excess of \$100 billion in payroll taxes that will devastate job providers.

President Clinton promised tax relief to families in 1992, reversed his position and hit Americans with a tax hike. Profamily rhetoric served the President well on the campaign trail. However, Republicans deliver in this budget by providing a \$500 per child tax credit to families earning less than \$200,000 a year. Sadly, while the President aggressively sought to fulfill pledges to abortion rights and gay advocacy groups upon inauguration, the tax relief promise to American families went out the window. A vote for this budget will remind American families that some elected officials still view the family as the most important component of our society.

Finally, the GOP budget cuts the budget deficit by \$278 billion over 5 years, \$152.6 billion more than the Clinton-Democrat budget. The priorities in the GOP budget as proposed by the Budget Committee Republicans reflect a philosophy of limited government, fiscal responsibility, and the virtue of the American family. I stand in the strongest support of this bold proposal.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Republican budget resolution offered by Mr. KASICH and in opposition to the Budget Committee's Clinton budget.

Once again, I believe the Members have an opportunity to demonstrate who is committed to curbing Congress' appetite to spend and who is not. The Democrat alternative furthers the Clinton administration's philosophy of creating more government, more spending, and higher taxes. On the other hand, the Republican budget takes bold steps, many of which will affect my constituents, to reduce the size of government and annual deficits. But it does so fairly, honestly, and specifically.

The Republican budget shaves the deficit by \$162 billion next year alone, and outsaves the Democratic budget by more than \$152 billion over the next 5 years. And it does so while covering the costs for market-based health care reform, the Republican welfare reform plan, and a \$500 per child tax deduction for middle-income families.

Although I am supporting the Kasich substitute because it is the only choice that is fiscally responsible, I strongly oppose the provision to increase revenue from the Power Marketing Administrations [PMA's]. While I am not opposed to sharing the sacrifice, this proposal to increase PMA revenues by \$4.8 billion over 5 years does not meet the definition of shared sacrifice. My PMA customers, who are served by the Bonneville Power Administration [BPA],

have already weathered severe rate impacts as a result of droughts and the Endangered Species Act. This is hardly the time to increase burden on ratepayers and Northwest businesses, such as our aluminum companies, who depend on BPA power for survival. As the ranking member of the subcommittee that has jurisdiction over the PMA's, I can assure my constituents I will continue to fight for reasonable and competitive power rates. It is important to remember the budget resolution is only a blueprint, and it is the authorizing committees who have the final say. You can be certain I would delete such a proposal at the authorizing level.

I want to congratulate Mr. KASICH for his outstanding work in crafting a credible Republican alternative. While not perfect, it is a big step in the right direction.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Republican Budget Committee alternative. I commend my colleague, JOHN KASICH, for his hard work in formulating a comprehensive alternative to the resolution reported by the Budget Committee. In developing this budget, Mr. KASICH went to authorizing committees seeking advice. He sought a plan we could stand behind, instead of resorting to a "this is what you get" approach. As a Republican leader on the Education and Labor Committee for work force issues, I sat down with JOHN KASICH to discuss my recommendations to consolidate overlapping and redundant job training programs. I was extremely pleased that many of my ideas were included in this alternative budget. As Republicans, we may not like all, or even most, of the individual cuts. But I can say that we were consulted. This budget's merit is the result of many innovative and creative Republican ideas which, if enacted, will save the taxpayers billions.

I support many of the concepts in the Republican alternative. While President Clinton promised a tax cut for middle-class families, many of my constituents called to let me know that they are still waiting. This budget does just that—it contains a \$500 per child tax credit, delivering on the President's campaign promise. This is one small step we can take to help families. Furthermore, there is no comparison between the levels of deficit reduction achieved between the Democratic and Republican Budget Committee proposals. The Republican proposal goes \$15 billion further in deficit reduction than the Democratic proposal in fiscal year 1995 alone. Our Republican budget pays for welfare, health care, and crime initiatives. And national defense is funded at a much more responsible level.

To be quite honest, Mr. Chairman, I disagree with specific cuts and increased spending in each of the alternatives before us today. None of the proposals is perfect. But to say that I would vote against all of them is not responsible governing. So, when I looked at each, I decided that the Republican Kasich alternative is much closer to my expectations for any plan which guides our Government's spending for the next year. The Republican plan pays—instead of looking the other way—for the President's ambitious domestic agenda. It has more deficit reduction, more incentives for working families, and lays a reasonable groundwork for reform.

But I do have concerns with the Kasich plan. My primary concern is that this budget cuts \$9.4 billion next year in education, training, employment, and social services while increasing defense spending by \$6.4 billion. Although I believe that the Democratic proposal brings defense spending to a point where national security could very well be jeopardized, it is just as wrong to cut job training and social services to a point where we are jeopardizing the future of our work force and its ability to compete in a global, high-tech economy. Times have changed. We can certainly do better in allocating limited Federal resources.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic Budget Committee proposal, which essentially is a rubber stamp of President Clinton's budget request, does not go far to reduce the deficit. The Kasich/Republican plan does not eliminate the deficit, either. Since, once again, a balanced budget amendment has been effectively killed for yet another Congress, I am supporting the Kasich resolution today because it moves the debate about deficit reduction in the right direction. By continuing to hammer away at this issue, I hope future budget debates can focus on less partisanship and more genuine concern for fiscal responsibility and cooperation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Kasich substitute.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I enter in the RECORD the language of two amendments that my Republican colleagues on the Budget Committee approved for inclusion in the Kasich alternative. The amendments deal with health care reform and should have been printed in the report to accompany House Concurrent Resolution 218.

The first amendment makes clear the Republican view that all Government-mandated health care reform should be on-budget. The second expresses the Republican view that health alliances and similar governmental entities should be prohibited from borrowing through the Treasury.

BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF HEALTH CARE REFORM

For purposes of budget scorekeeping by the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office, any proposed change in law concerning health care reform shall be properly reflected in the Federal budget.

Any obligation, payroll tax, assessment, premium or fee required of an employer or of any other individual and which is to be paid to a particular entity established pursuant to Federal law shall be treated as a Federal receipt. Any related expenditure made by any such entity required pursuant to Federal law shall be treated as a Federal outlay.

This provision is particularly important in light of the administration's failure to include the true cost of its health care reform plan in the fiscal year 1995 budget submission by OMB. The administration's health care reform plan would constitute the largest tax increase and largest expansion of entitlement spending in U.S. history.

ALLIANCES OR OTHER GOVERNMENT HEALTH ENTITY BORROWING PROHIBITED

No health alliance or other government health entity shall be granted the authority to engage in public borrowing through the Department of the Treasury.

Ms. SCHENK. Mr. Chairman I agree with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle

that we need to further cut Federal spending. I agree that we need to continue to reduce our Nation's deficit. But, there is a right way and a wrong way to reduce spending and the Kasich substitute is the wrong way to accomplish this goal.

Last year I helped craft and voted for a package of spending cuts along with Mr. KASICH and Mr. PENNY. While I did not like everything in Penny-Kasich, I was willing to make tough choices for the sake of deficit reduction. Next week, we will have the opportunity to vote on a balanced budget amendment and I will vote for this amendment because I believe it is time for this Government to live within its means.

The debate here is not only about how much money the Government should spend, it is also about how we should reorder our national priorities. And while I agree that we need to reduce the deficit, I don't agree that we should do it by cutting funding for AIDS research or funding for research for breast and ovarian cancer or funding for student loans. I don't agree that we should cut in half funding for fusion research which offers hope for an endless supply of clean energy. This is exactly what the Kasich substitute would do.

The Kasich substitute is not about cutting spending—it is a policy statement that, if enacted, would turn our country in the wrong direction. There is a difference between making tough choices and making irresponsible choices. The Kasich substitute makes irresponsible and unacceptable decisions about how we should allocate scarce resources and for this reason it should be defeated.

Mr. KASICH has been a leader in the fight to reduce the deficit. I have worked with him in the past and I look forward to working with him in the future as we attempt to eliminate wasteful spending. But on this substitute and with these choices, I cannot support his effort.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I have the honor and privilege of serving the people of the 23d District of Texas. I ask my colleagues to remember that all of us were sent here to represent the people. Each and every one of us has a responsibility to support a budget which serves to increase the individual freedom of our employer, the American citizen; and vote against any budget alternative which seeks to turn citizens into subjects by expanding the size and power of the Federal Government.

Out in the Davis Mountains, deep in west Texas, is the McDonald Observatory. It has one of the world's most powerful telescopes, capable of viewing distant galaxies. My colleagues, we do not need that great telescope to look into the hearts and minds of the American people, we only need to open our eyes and ears.

I have carefully reviewed the various budget alternatives before us and am very disappointed and discouraged to report that most fail to serve the needs of the American people. These proposals are just the latest jumble of high taxes and deficit spending that Washington has concocted. My colleagues, the American people have had enough of these business-as-usual budgets. If you can't hear your constituents' voices, come to Texas. Come to Laredo, come to Odessa, come to Del Rio, come to Alpine—the common sense

will be deafening. The jig is up. Government must once again serve the people.

My colleagues, if you are willing to listen to the American people there is a bright spot. Mr. KASICH has offered a commonsense substitute. Voting for this substitute will be an important step in restoring the people's trust in their Government. The commonsense budget includes fully funded comprehensive reform of the welfare and health care systems. The commonsense budget provides a needed \$500 per child tax credit for working Americans. The commonsense budget insures that our military forces are adequately funded. The commonsense budget reduces deficit spending by more than \$152 billion.

My colleagues, let's use common sense when spending the people's dollars and cents. Remember, it's their money, not ours. All of us have promised to serve the American people. It is time for this Congress to keep its word. Vote for the commonsense budget and restore to the American people their income and freedom.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the President's business as usual budget and in strong support of both the Republican alternatives.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that the economy is improving. How much this has to do with the President's policies and how much it has to do with the business cycle is another matter. Indeed, polls show that a majority of Americans, 64 percent, do not credit Bill Clinton's policies with the economy's resurgence. They seem to agree with one well-known economist who said the economy would have improved, "if voters had elected Bugs Bunny." That seems to be the prevailing attitude in the financial community as well. No one seriously believes that the President's budget, which did not go into effect until October, is responsible for what happened all last year. Positive trends were already well in place, but that may not last long.

Take the employment picture, which, though improving slightly, is still very shaky. The economy is simply not creating the types of jobs that will propel the economy strongly forward. In the past few months we have seen many large companies, GTE, Westinghouse, and others, announce huge layoffs. And statistics show that many of the high-wage jobs lost during the recession are being replaced with jobs of a lower-wage, higher-turnover variety, a trend that has been a boon for the temporary employment industry.

One of the reasons temporary workers are so attractive is that they are not subject to many of the rules and regulations full-time workers are. And if the Clinton administration is successful in enacting its labor agenda—which includes a higher minimum wage indexed to inflation—and I noticed where the head of the House, Speaker TOM FOLEY's task force on homelessness, recently called for a minimum hourly wage of \$6 or more, a ban on striker replacements, increases in pension plan premiums, and new OSHA regulations—they will succeed only in exacerbating the unstable employment situation. The result would be even more temps, more overtime, more mechanization, and fewer jobs.

There is also the need to consider the higher tax bills facing upper-income Americans this

year. Remember, President Clinton raised the top marginal rate on income to 39.6 percent and made it retroactive to January 1 of last year. So many Americans will be faced with a big tax bill come April 15. And even though they can take 3 years to pay it off, it will still have a restraining effect.

Furthermore, the new, higher withholding rates have gone into effect, which will reduce take-home pay and is likely to result in less borrowing, less investment, less spending, and less saving. And if that is not enough to make tax season rougher than usual, many Americans will find that refinancing their house has cut the amount they can deduct for mortgage interest—by far the largest deduction most people take—making their tax bill even higher.

So I would warn my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to put away the "Happy Days Are Here Again" sheet music. There is still a long way to go before we can assess the effects of Clintonomics.

Let me return to the specific budgets we have been presented with today, starting with the President's plan.

By the administration's own admission, the Clinton defense proposal is underfunded by at least \$20 billion. This would require defense spending to fall from \$292.4 billion in fiscal 1993 to \$258.1 billion in fiscal 1999. Realistically speaking, how can we possibly project American power and protect American interests on an isolationist budget? The post-cold war world, as we discover almost every day, is still a very dangerous place. I know that is said an awful lot, but it is true. The geopolitical map of the world may have changed, but man hasn't. As Plato said, "only the dead have seen the end of war." So we must still maintain readiness, while planning for a shift in defense requirements.

Further weakening our defense posture is the fact that, under Clinton, critical funding is being siphoned away from core defense needs to noncore missions such as defense conversion and environmental research. We don't have a dime to waste on this type of liberal nonsense.

You know, we on this side of the aisle have taken to calling the Clinton budget the MIA budget, because there is so much that is missing from it. For example, the budget leaves out \$100 billion in mandatory premiums paid by businesses and individuals as well as the benefits paid out from those receipts. Welfare reform, which is estimated to cost some \$7 billion a year, is also missing. Neither does Clinton offer any clue as to how he is going to pay for implementation of the GATT accord, the Superfund, or his crime package. For these initiatives alone he will need to come up with \$34 billion.

And what do we get for all this flim-flammy? More deficit spending, to the tune of \$370 billion over 5 years, and higher deficits. That's right. Higher deficits. According to the President's own numbers, the budget deficit will increase from \$176 billion in 1995 to \$201 billion in 1999. And another \$1.7 trillion will be added to the national debt.

I am proud to say, however, that two Republicans, Mr. KASICH and Mr. SOLOMON, have offered alternatives that are light years ahead of the Clinton plan.

The Solomon plan does something that Clinton promised to do during the campaign,

but hasn't come close to achieving—a balanced budget in 5 years. It does so with a package of 500 spending cuts totaling over \$600 billion. It does not reduce Social Security, cut veteran's benefits, or raise taxes. It does lower the spending caps to ensure that the bulk of the savings achieved will be used to balance the budget, while including funding for such important initiatives as the Republican welfare reform proposal, the Republican crime proposal, and the Republican health care reform bill.

The other Republican plan, the Kasich plan, provides not only more deficit reduction than the Clinton plan, but also provides job creation incentives, family tax relief, and Government reform, while also including health, crime, and welfare reform bills. Among its best features is a \$500 per child tax credit, which would keep \$63 million from leaving my district. This would help countless other working families throughout America. It also indexes capital gains to inflation, something I have strongly advocated for years. Further, it would provide for immediate expensing of business equipment. And it would do all this and still achieve \$153 billion more in deficit reduction than the Clinton-Democrat plan.

In sum, the Clinton administration came in promising change, but it is the Republicans who are offering real change. I therefore, urge all my colleagues to oppose the President's plan and support the Republican alternative of your choice.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we must decide whether to stay the course or set out in a new direction.

The budget before us today was prepared by the Clinton administration and rubber stamped by the Budget Committee. It follows the basic directions laid out last year in the 5-year plan devised by President Clinton.

I had serious reservations about that plan when it was discussed in this room a year ago, and today I am absolutely convinced that it is taking us in the wrong direction.

Granted, objecting to any initiative is easy if one fails to put forth some alternative proposal. Indeed, I would not waste your time, Mr. Chairman, or that of my constituents by suggesting that the President is wrong unless I held a superior plan in my hand—the Kasich budget.

Why is the Kasich plan better? I'll give you five reasons.

First, the Kasich alternative would refrain from spending \$152 billion over the next 5 years that would otherwise be borrowed and spent under the Clinton plan. That is fiscal discipline and it results in lower interest costs in the short term and less accumulated debt over the long term.

Second, the Kasich alternative calls for the adoption of specific, tangible reforms in the decision-making process here in Washington. A cost-benefit analysis would be performed before we ask private citizens and the business community to comply with any new bureaucratic rules and regulations.

Of particular interest to me is the section reviewing the need to relieve State and local governments from the burden of unfunded federal mandates. County commissioners from all over the country met here in Washington earlier this week to discuss this matter and I am

delighted that their concerns have been recognized.

Third, the Kasich alternative makes a good faith effort to fix our ailing health care system and reform Federal welfare programs. And, unlike the Clinton health care plan and yet-to-be released welfare reform proposal, the Kasich plan locks in savings provided by these reforms for deficit reduction.

Fourth, the Kasich alternative provides a more realistic Defense budget that will allow the United States to pursue a sound post-cold war national security policy. The Clinton administration has conceded their proposed Defense spending levels are insufficient to adequately fund their Defense program outlined in the Bottom-Up Review. The Kasich plan restores and reprioritizes Defense spending in an effort to preserve our military capability and clearly define the United States role in the world.

Finally, the Kasich plan also recognizes the contributions and sacrifices our veterans have made in protecting the peace, liberty and interests in our country. I strongly support and applauds the Kasich plan for increasing veterans medical care by \$110 million, restoring the Clinton administration's \$52 million cut in medical and prosthetic research, and adding 50 FTE's to the Board of Veterans Appeals to help reduce the 2-year backlog.

The Kasich alternative is a voluminous, multifaceted document, but I believe that these five elements alone would put us on a fundamentally different course than that advocated by the President.

For those of my colleagues who favor this new direction but are concerned about the fate of a particular program, I would ask you to resist the temptation to reject the entire plan on the basis of a single line item. It would be difficult to find two people, much less a majority, who could agree on where every penny goes in a budget of \$1.5 trillion.

Indeed, in my capacity as a Pennsylvanian and as the ranking member of the Aviation Subcommittee, I have concerns about elements of the Kasich alternative.

The consolidation of all economic development programs into a single block grant program troubles me greatly. Before I was elected to the House of Representatives I served as general counsel in the Economic Development Administration, and since being elected I have worked hard to see that EDA effectively leverages non-Federal money to help communities develop the infrastructure that is needed to retain and attract new industry.

As the ranking member on the Aviation Subcommittee, I take issue with the Kasich proposal to privatize the air traffic control functions of the Federal Aviation Administration. It is, I believe, premature to make such a recommendation because the FAA is studying this proposal and will make its recommendations to the Congress next month. The Public Works and Transportation Committee will then carefully review these recommendations.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the Kasich plan is the better plan and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, today the House is once again presented with a clear choice: between yet another, business-as-usual budget from the White House or a

budget from this House that cuts taxes, makes real spending cuts, and proposes major new reforms in welfare and crime. If you want real change, the Kasich budget is the one to support.

In New Jersey, our new Governor, Christie Whitman, has asked for and received a 5-percent reduction in the State income tax. At the same time, the Governor is committed to reducing government costs by submitting all State programs to a strict priority ordering. Governor Whitman is determined to give the citizens of her State better government for less money. Here in this Congress, we should make the same kind of commitment and we can, by passing the Kasich budget.

The White House still doesn't get it. They talk about serious spending restraints, but they continue to increase funding for all nonmilitary discretionary programs. The Kasich budget does it better—real cuts in both taxes and spending and even better deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, the Kasich budget offers the American people what we in New Jersey know to be true. Government should pursue its central mission—that of serving the people's needs, instead of the needs of bureaucrats and their special interest groups. The Kasich budget demonstrates that the American people can get better Government at less cost, and also get to keep more of their own money which will help our economy grow.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the Kasich budget.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain a few things for those people across the Nation who are watching this debate.

We will hear a lot of numbers being batted back and forth in this Chamber today. We will hear terms like baselines, out years, budget authority, allocations, sequesters, and CBO scoring.

But don't be fooled. We're not talking about quantum physics here. This debate is really about power—the power of government versus the power of the American people.

On the one hand, we have the Democrats' budget. It relies on the same tired formula they have peddled for years: more social spending; more careless defense cuts; more big deficits. Equally as interesting is what's not in their budget: no health care reform; no welfare reform; and no tough crime bill.

Taken together, this visionless document is the very essence of status quo. It continues to feed the same failed Government policies with the personal and financial freedom of America's middle-class families.

In stark contrast, we Republicans have offered an alternative called putting families first. This comprehensive package provides tax relief for families, incentives for job creation, greater deficit reduction, and funding for welfare reform, health care reform and a tough, comprehensive crime bill—all paid for with meaningful spending cuts.

In short, the Republican alternative is a blueprint for the future, that invests in people not government.

So as the debate carries on, ask yourself one question: Do I still have faith in Government to take my money and look out for my best interests? If you do, great—support the Democrats' budget. However, if you don't—if

you think that Government is too big and that America's families need more freedom to look after their own best interests—support the Republican alternative.

The choice is simple, and I believe the answer is obvious.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 165, yeas 243, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

AYES—165

Allard	Gingrich
Archer	Goodlatte
Armey	Goodling
Bachus (AL)	Goss
Baker (CA)	Grams
Baker (LA)	Grandy
Ballenger	Greenwood
Barrett (NE)	Gunderson
Bartlett	Hancock
Bateman	Hansen
Bereuter	Hastert
Bilirakis	Hefley
Bliley	Herger
Blute	Hobson
Boehner	Hoekstra
Bonilla	Hoke
Bunning	Houghton
Burton	Hunter
Buyer	Hutchinson
Callahan	Hyde
Calvert	Inglis
Camp	Inhofe
Canady	Istook
Castle	Johnson (CT)
Clinger	Johnson, Sam
Coble	Kasich
Collins (GA)	Kim
Combest	King
Condit	Kingston
Cooper	Klug
Crapo	Knollenberg
Cunningham	Kolbe
Deal	Kyl
DeLay	Lazio
Dickey	Leach
Doolittle	Levy
Dornan	Lewis (FL)
Dreier	Linder
Duncan	Livingston
Dunn	Manzullo
Ehlers	McCandless
Emerson	McCollum
Everett	McCrery
Ewing	McDade
Fawell	McHugh
Fingerhut	McInnis
Fish	McKeon
Fowler	Meyers
Franks (CT)	Mica
Franks (NJ)	Michel
Gallely	Miller (FL)
Gekas	Molinar
Geren	Moorhead
Gilchrest	Myers
Gillmor	Nussle

Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Przyce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—243

Ackerman	Barlow
Andrews (ME)	Barrett (WI)
Andrews (NJ)	Becerra
Applegate	Beilenson
Bacchus (FL)	Bentley
Baessler	Berman
Barca	Bevill
Barcia	Bilbray

Bishop
Blackwell
Boehert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder

Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega
(AS)
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gedden
Gephardt
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes

Hutto
Inalee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Long
Lowe
MacHale
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies
Mezvinisky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Penny
Peterson (FL)

NOT VOTING—30

Abercrombie	Gallo	Meehan
Andrews (TX)	Gibbons	Miller (CA)
Barton	Gutierrez	Natcher
Brooks	Hastings	Orton
Collins (IL)	Hayes	Pelosi
Cox	Kopetski	Reynolds
Crane	Lewis (CA)	Rostenkowski
Dooley	Lightfoot	Shaw
Fields (TX)	Lloyd	Slatery
Ford (TN)	McMillan	Towns

□ 1353

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Barton for, with Mr. Abercrombie against.

Mr. Fields of Texas for, Mr. Collins of Illinois against.

Mr. Gallo for, Mr. Dooley against.

Mr. Lewis of California for, Mr. Meehan against.

Mr. Lightfoot for, Mr. Orton against.

Mr. McMillan for, Mr. Slattey against.

Mr. FORD of Michigan changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. WALSH changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

FINAL PERIOD OF GENERAL DEBATE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order for a final period of debate.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, the House will vote today to continue the unprecedented and successful economic growth and deficit reduction initiatives that the Congress and President Clinton began last year.

We enter into this debate with an economy that is improving in all sectors. Because of the aggressive and realistic deficit reduction package enacted last year by this Democratic Congress and the Democratic administration, nationwide unemployment is now down to 6.5 percent, job creation is up by 1.9 million private sector jobs, inflation is in check, and the economic outlook is the best we have witnessed in decades.

We achieved these goals through a combination of steady deficit reduction and targeted investments. The budget resolution continues these efforts by bringing down the 1995 deficit to \$175.3 billion, the lowest level in 5 years, and more than \$100 billion below the projections made last year. At the same time, the budget provides for increased investment into critical areas such as education and training, research and development, the transportation infrastructure, and crime control initiatives.

Mr. Chairman, I want to continue these positive trends. As you know, my own State of California is still lagging behind the rest of the country. We have been hard hit by defense cuts, by natural disasters and by a persistent recession. For this reason, I want our national economy to continue to improve so that my State of California will also have a chance to benefit more from the positive results of President Clinton's national economic program.

This means adopting the Sabo budget resolution today. This means continuing the effective economic growth plan we passed last year. This means continuing our tough deficit reduction plan and holding down interest rates.

I urge my colleagues to support the Sabo budget resolution and keep our economy moving forward.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 218, the fiscal year 1995 budget resolution drafted by Mr. SABO and his colleagues.

House Concurrent Resolution 218 follows the steady path of deficit reduction and gen-

eral economic recovery initiated by the President's deficit reduction plan.

This budget resolution reflects both the realities and the priorities of last year's \$500 billion deficit reduction package.

There is deficit reduction—the deficit will drop from \$255 billion in fiscal year 1993 to \$175 billion in fiscal year 1995. Indeed, the budget deficit will drop from 4.9 percent of the gross domestic product to 2.5 percent of the GDP in fiscal year 1995. House Concurrent Resolution 218 cuts \$102 billion from domestic discretionary spending, terminates over 100 programs, and cuts 200 other programs. Moreover, for the first time in 26 years, total discretionary spending will actually decline with passage of this budget resolution. It is important to note that these cuts are a direct result of last year's enactment of the President's deficit reduction package which many of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle said would wreak havoc on the economy.

The budget resolution targets \$13.6 billion to a number of investment priorities. Job training would be boosted by \$497 million. Spending to stop crime and put more police on the street would be increased by \$2.5 billion. Head Start would receive \$700 million, and efforts to reform our schools would be augmented with \$595 million in new resources.

This budget resolution is not all things to all people. It is the best budget resolution that we will vote on today. In addition, there will be plenty of opportunities during the appropriations process to cut Federal spending.

While last year's deficit reduction package and this budget resolution will help continue the current national economic recovery, I believe that we need to do more to bring jobs to regions of this country that have not fully emerged from the recession, like Rhode Island. In light of this disparity, I urge my colleagues to consider job creating legislation or a regional economic development plan.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to support the Budget Committee's resolution today. However, I want to alert you to one outstanding issue contained in the budget resolution. In this resolution, the House Budget Committee adopted a new baseline for our crop insurance system—effectively combining mandatory spending from the crop insurance program with ad hoc discretionary spending from the disaster assistance program. North Dakotans are very familiar with both these programs. North Dakota's producers rank first in participation in the crop insurance system for most crops based on acres enrolled. North Dakota has also unfortunately become all too familiar with disaster assistance, with a severe drought in 1988 and most recently the 500-year flood of 1993. The House acted in historic fashion today, combining these funds to strengthen the crop insurance system in a historic tradeoff for disaster assistance that is harder to get.

I want to caution my colleagues that I believe the House Budget Committee did not go far enough and as a result, while the shift in the baseline is historic, the funds available may not be enough to accomplish our objective of increased individual risk management rather than annual disaster appropriations bills.

Before we enter negotiations with our colleagues in the other body, I encourage Mem-

bers to remember that we cannot accomplish our goal of eliminating off-budget, ad hoc spending without the necessary investment to improve the Federal crop insurance system.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, the arrival of the President's budget on Capitol Hill signals the beginning of the annual budget process in Congress. It is a long process, taking the remainder of the year to complete and requires the passage of many bills and resolutions. The budget resolution and the alternatives debated today define a broad guideline on how much the Government will take in through taxes and other receipts and also spend on Federal programs. The President's signature is not required on the budget resolution, and the final product does not carry the force of law.

I am opposed to the spending plan crafted by President Clinton and the House Democrats on the Budget Committee. The President and the Democratic leadership have made promises to reform the welfare system, provide tax relief, cut spending, reform the health care system, and stop crime. Yet, the budget for fiscal year 1995 shows that once again, these promises that the American people deserve have not been fulfilled. For instance, the Democratic budget glosses over anticrime legislation and only calls for funding 50,000 police officers, not the 100,000 the President promised. In contrast the Republican budget initiative fully funds a Comprehensive Crime Control Act and adds \$2 billion for new police and \$3 billion for Federal-State partnerships to build new prisons. The Democratic budget also fails to fund welfare and health care reform proposals. Finally, on the issue of deficit reduction, the Republican plan cuts the deficit to about \$162 billion next year, and includes about \$15 billion more in deficit reduction than the Democratic plan. Over 5 years, the Republican plan achieves \$152.6 billion more in deficit reduction than the Democrats.

On the other hand, the plan drafted by the Republicans addresses many of the major problems that my constituents in North Carolina are discussing. It establishes real priorities and pays for them. The Republican budget initiative provides family tax relief, reforms the welfare system, regains control of our streets and neighborhoods through anticrime measures, provides incentives for job creations, reforms the health care system, and reduces the deficit. Even more importantly, this plan is paid for through 200 real spending cuts and genuine reform. It lowers spending, taxes, and the deficit. Under the Republican plan, the deficit will be reduced approximately \$310 billion over 5 years. In my considered opinion, it is a strong, well-thought-out plan and deserves support.

In particular, one of the major highlights is the \$500-per-child tax credit. This tax credit will partially offset the burdensome taxes imposed by President Clinton and the Democratic leadership last August. Under the Republican plan, a \$500-per-child tax credit will be available to families earning less than \$200,000 a year. Seventy-four percent of this credit will go to families earning less than \$60,000 a year. Roughly, \$59 million a year in family tax relief will be available or about \$80 more every month for a family of four for groceries or savings. The Heritage Foundation, a

Washington, DC, think tank, estimates that in the 10th Congressional District there are roughly 116,159 children eligible for the tax credit. The \$500 tax credit would return about \$58 million to my district. And again, because of spending cuts in the bill, these tax credits will not affect the deficit.

Finally, I would like to say a word about a sincere proposal put forth by my good friends Representatives FAWELL and SOLOMON. Since I was elected to serve in Congress in 1986, I have worked to reduce deficit spending and balance the budget. The Fawell-Solomon plan is a package of 500 spending cuts that would reduce the deficit by \$600 billion. It is the only budget plan that does balance the budget. Given that the House plans to debate a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution next week, it seemed hypocritical to me to not support an effort that achieves this goal. As with other bills considered and debated by Congress, this legislation includes some cuts that I consider painful and do not support, for example it eliminates the tobacco subsidy for tobacco farmers. But, I considered a vote for this budget resolution a vote for balancing the budget, not a vote for specific policy changes. In fact, as noted above, the budget resolution does not have the force of law and there is legislative language in the plan that states that the appropriate committees must make the specific spending reductions.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 218, the fiscal 1995 budget resolution. I wish to commend Chairman SABO and his colleagues on the Budget Committee for their outstanding work in developing this measure and bringing it to the floor.

This resolution continues the progress we started last year with the adoption of the 5-year budget agreement initiated by President Clinton. That plan provided for some \$496 billion in deficit reduction over 5 years, more than half of which comes from hard cuts in every category of Federal spending.

That budget agreement has been enormously successful to date. Indeed, the budget deficit was \$300 billion when President Bush left office in 1992. It was \$180 billion at the end of 1993. While that is still a lot of red ink, clearly we are heading in the right direction.

The budget resolution we are considering today continues us along the deficit reduction glidepath. It conforms to the spending caps for discretionary spending which were established under last year's budget agreement. In so doing, it actually reduces discretionary spending for the first time since 1969.

For those who believe, as I do, that the best way to balance the budget is to cut spending, this is certainly welcome news. Indeed, under this resolution, the deficit will fall to \$175 billion in fiscal 1995. That is some \$115 billion less than the deficit was just 3 years ago.

Just as importantly, it achieves these targets without increasing taxes, and without forcing any single industries or sectors of the economy to bear a disproportionate burden of the spending cuts.

While I am generally satisfied with the framework of this budget agreement, I really believe we should be doing even more in the way of spending cuts. I intend to continue my efforts this year, just as I have always done in

the past, to identify and vote against those spending programs which we don't need or can't afford.

For example, I intend to vote once again to terminate funding for the \$30 billion space station, which we just can't afford. I also intend to support across-the-board cuts where necessary, and to vote against any appropriations bills which come before the House where spending levels cannot be justified.

In other words, I view this budget resolution as only a starting point for deficit reduction—one which we can and will improve on through the adoption of additional spending cuts this year.

I also intend to oppose the substitute amendments which have been proposed by Representatives FRANK, MFUME, KASICH, and SOLOMON. While I appreciate their efforts, and agree with some aspects of their proposals, none of these substitutes represents sound budget or tax policy at this time.

Both the Frank and Mfume amendments would cut defense spending below the level requested by President Clinton. While I support the effort to reorder our military priorities in the post-cold war era, we must maintain an acceptable level of military preparedness. I place great weight in the President's determination, as Commander in Chief, that these proposals go too far in cutting defense spending at this time, and could put our national security at some risk.

The Kasich amendment would add some \$6.4 billion in defense spending, which is too much. At the same time, it could threaten the very fragile economic recovery we are experiencing by draining some \$119 billion in tax revenues from the Treasury.

The last time we enacted a tax cut of that magnitude in 1981—which I voted against—the budget deficit quadrupled almost overnight. We don't need to repeat that same mistake again.

Similarly, I believe the Solomon amendment would increase the deficit significantly over the long run.

That is because much of the savings proposed under this amendment would come from Medicare. That is the same source of savings which President Clinton has proposed to tap to pay for much of his national health care reform program.

As my colleagues know, health care spending is the single fastest growing part of the Federal budget. If we are really serious about deficit reduction, then we have to start by getting health care costs under control.

The Solomon substitute would make it difficult, if not impossible, to get the health care reform effort off the ground, by earmarking these savings for deficit reduction instead of health care reform. Indeed, it would lock us into a fiscal straightjacket, where long-term health care spending—and the Federal deficit—will continue to skyrocket, in exchange for some limited, short-term deficit reduction.

I believe we need to continue to scrutinize the Federal budget very carefully, and to identify additional areas to cut. We also need to examine ways to control the rising costs of Medicare and other entitlement programs.

However, we have to do so in a manner which makes sense, and which will not do more harm than good over the long run. I be-

lieve the committee resolution is fair and balanced. It offers a reasoned combination of spending cuts for the most part, and contains a viable enforcement mechanism. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, as we debate the budget resolution for fiscal year 1995, I can't help but recall a similar debate that took place in this Chamber less than a year ago. At that time, much like today, a lot of predictions were being made about the effects of the deficit reduction bill. There were those who said then that the bill was "a recipe for economic and fiscal disaster"—Mr. CRANE, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD March 18, 1993. Some said "it will raise your taxes, increase the deficit, and kill over 1 million jobs"—Mr. HEFLEY, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD August 4, 1993. Still others claimed that the package simply "would not lower the deficit"—Mr. HERGER, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD August 4, 1993. The "gloom and doom" predictions of economic devastation went on and on.

There's one difference in the debate this year, however. The effects of last year's deficit reduction bill are no longer a matter of speculation. The naysayers have been proven wrong.

Because of the bill we approved last year, the Federal budget deficit is finally moving in the right direction. The expected deficit next year—fiscal year 1995—is \$126 billion less than President Bush predicted it would be under his policies. That's a 40-percent reduction. And the size of the deficit compared to the overall economy has been cut nearly in half, to the lowest percentage since 1979.

The economy and financial markets have reacted favorably to the actions we took last year. Interest rates are at the lowest levels in 20 years, and these lower rates have helped many families buy their first home and enable millions more to refinance their mortgages and save hundreds of dollars each month. Inflation also remains low, and consumer confidence and spending is up. And the best news is that more new jobs have been created in the past year than in the previous 4 years combined.

And what about all those new taxes that were going to crush jobs and hurt millions of hard working Americans? The reality is that income taxes were raised on only 1.2 percent of the wealthiest Americans.

The gas tax you heard so much about—the one that was supposed to drain your bank account and drive businesses into bankruptcy—hasn't even caused a blip in the economy. In fact, gas prices are actually lower now than they were before this tax was imposed.

Not only have taxes not gone up for most Americans, they've gone down for the small businesses and start-up companies who've taken advantage of the job-creating tax incentives in our budget bill.

Taxes have also gone down for millions of working Americans under the earned income tax credit. This credit makes sure that parents who work full time make enough money to put their families above the poverty line—an important first step toward welfare reform.

The bill we passed last year has also laid the groundwork for long-term economic growth. Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan recently said:

The underlying, long-term economic outlook in this country is improving quite

measurable and, indeed, I don't recall as good an underlying base for the long-term outlook that we have today in the last two or three decades.

The best outlook in 20 or 30 years. That's a far cry from what the naysayers were predicting last year.

We achieved this progress by establishing in law a 5-year program to cut spending by \$255 billion, cut entitlements, eliminate entire programs, and reduce the Government work force. We put tight caps on what can be spent on the operations of the Government. The result is that Federal spending in 1995 on everything other than entitlements and interest will be held below 1994 levels, with no adjustment for inflation.

Now we can and we must do more, especially on entitlement spending. This year's budget resolution continues the program of serious deficit reduction and fiscal restraint that started last year. It will end 100 Federal programs and reduce more than 200 others. It will bring the 1995 deficit down to \$175.3 billion, the lowest level in 5 years. It contains no new taxes and still fully funds the President's anticrime initiative.

The decisions we made last year are working. The economy is recovering. Jobs are being created. The deficit is going down. Interest rates are staying down. We're in the best economic shape in two or three decades. We're building a strong foundation for long-term growth.

The right vote today is to continue this progress by voting "yes" on the budget resolution.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, today the House of Representatives will consider five directions that the budget of our Federal Government can take in the next 5 years. The Clinton budget and the four other substitutes that are before us today each have their own positive and negative aspects. While deliberating over these five plans, I kept certain concerns of my constituents in mind. I knew that in a State with tax rates among the highest in the country, families in my district would be looking for a break from the tax burden. I knew that these same families do not want to leave a massive budget deficit to their children. I knew that people in my district, especially those in Waterbury, want relief from the terror of violent and random crime. Finally, I knew that the supposed economic recovery that President Clinton tries to create through words every day has not reached my State. It is my feeling that the Kasich substitute best addresses these concerns.

Let me speak a little about each budget alternative. First, the Democrat budget supported by President Clinton is a continuation of the flawed budget act that I voted against last year. That is, it is a budget that focuses on tax increases enacted to fund new spending programs. Despite the claims that the Clinton administration is cutting spending to lower the deficit, this Democrat budget actually increases total spending by \$36 billion. Most of the spending cuts are again coming from the defense budget and the hardware that Connecticut workers have built with years of acquired expertise. While some Members of Congress feel that the military and political threats to America are gone, I feel that Presi-

dent Clinton and the Democrats are being too unwary in their analysis of the world situation. The American military was the major obstacle to the extension of Soviet power and influence during the cold war. We should not disassemble it so casually. At some point in the future, the United States may have to be involved in conflict again. Let's make sure that we have the best equipment possible to minimize the number of American casualties.

I was astonished to see that President Clinton did not include his health care reform bill in the budget. Considering that health care reform is supposed to be a major focus of this administration, I can only guess that President Clinton is trying to hide the monster that he and his wife created. We all know now that the Clinton health care plan would be the largest expansion of Federal entitlements in history, along with the largest tax increase in history. I will not vote for a budget that does not contain a credible and complete health care reform package.

The Frank substitute only differs from the Democrat budget in that it reduces the defense budget by an additional \$2.4 billion for 1995 and by \$25 billion over 5 years. I recognize that, year after year, some Members think that national defense is a convenient place to cut spending, but I disagree with this view. The Frank substitute is just providing another source of funding for President Clinton's new spending programs, still included in this version of the budget.

The Congressional Black Caucus has also offered a substitute budget that attempts to deal with the problems of the Nation, especially those of the urban poor. While I recognize these problems, I see that the Congressional Black Caucus is promoting the same big-Government approach that has failed for the past 30 years. How much more money are we going to waste before we realize that the Federal Government cannot solve problems of the urban poor with costly programs enacted in Washington?

The Solomon budget on the surface seems to be a budget worthy of support. It balances the budget in 5 years with a wide range of spending cuts. However, upon closer examination, I see that the Solomon budget contains too many egregious spending cuts. I have been a relentless supporter of the space station as the next step in our space program, and I have supported the *Seawolf* submarine and the C-130H aircraft as key elements of our national security for this decade. A balanced budget amendment and a Presidential line-item veto would allow Congress and the President to make the most reasonable spending cuts from the budget.

In contrast to all of these budget options, the Kasich substitute is formed around the concerns that I hear from my constituents. It reduces the deficit by \$310 billion over 5 years—over \$150 billion more than the Democrat budget—with a variety of real spending cuts. And at the same time, it includes policies that will enhance economic growth through business incentives and more money for families to keep at tax time.

The Kasich substitute includes a welfare reform proposal which stresses work instead of handouts and seeks to put people on payrolls rather than public assistance rolls. States and

local governments will have greater flexibility to shape aid to families with dependent children and other programs. I am especially heartened to note that this budget addresses issues that I have been stressing during this Congress: illegitimacy and parental responsibility. Finally, the welfare reform proposal takes the savings from these changes and gives it back to the taxpayer—over \$18 billion over 5 years. No more will welfare be a income redistribution program perpetuating poverty.

In addition to welfare reform, the Kasich substitute tackles the modern crime problem head on with a comprehensive law enforcement and criminal punishment program. The measure includes \$2 billion over 5 years for local police officers and \$3 billion for Federal and State partnerships for new prisons. These are crime-fighting initiatives that Republicans have been advocating for years. President Clinton says that he is open to proposals that get tough on crime. This budget contains those proposals.

The Kasich substitute fully funds the Affordable Health Care Now Act—The health care alternative that expands access to health coverage, contains cost, and most importantly, assures that medical decisions are made with patients and doctors, not Government bureaucrats. President Clinton does not care about this plan, but it is the only health care plan included in the budgets offered today.

Many of my constituents have been asking me what Congress has been doing to improve the job situation. Those Clinton-backed defense cuts and increased taxes have not encouraged job growth in my district. Changes in the tax code under President Clinton have instead taken money away from working people. The Kasich substitute encourages higher levels of saving, investing, and risk-taking as a better way to improve the economy. One incentive in this budget, fully deductible IRA accounts, will allow Americans to save for their retirement while providing money for business investment.

Perhaps the most exciting aspect of the Kasich substitute is the tax changes for families with dependent children. Families earning less than \$200,000 per household would be eligible for a \$500-per-child tax credit. Ninety percent of this tax break would go to families with incomes below \$75,000 per year. At a time in which more of our Nation's leaders are acknowledging the importance of strong families, this tax credit is welcome news.

As I did last year during budget debate, let me repeat President Clinton's campaign promise of a middle-class tax cut. Candidate Clinton said that he would offer middle-class families \$60 billion in tax cuts over 4 years in the form of a \$300 tax cut per couple or a \$300-per-child tax credit. Well, here's my vote for a \$500-per-child tax credit. I am still waiting for President Clinton's. While President Clinton once had a vision for the future, the Kasich budget is the only budget substitute that outlines one.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for the budget resolution as passed by the House Budget Committee. As a member of the committee who spent many hours drafting this legislation, I know this is a good budget. This budget keeps dis-

cretionary spending under the caps established last year. For the first time since 1969, discretionary spending will actually fall under this budget. This committee was able to come up with \$3.1 billion in additional cuts beyond the President's proposal, and even with these cuts I believe this budget is effective in carrying out the important initiatives set forth by the President, including crime control and prevention and criminal justice reforms, more funding for Head Start, health research, and job training, and infrastructure improvements.

The four substitute budgets being offered today contain some proposals with merit; however, it is my feeling these proposals have not received appropriate scrutiny through the committee process. For instance, two of these substitutes recommend the privatization of the Federal air traffic control and safety system. While this idea and others may be worthwhile, I find it difficult to support such broad reform measures without time for careful examination.

Additionally, I have not seen CBO's estimates of the Solomon substitute. And, while I share the goals of the Congressional Black Caucus to increase resources for housing, health care, and education, I am reluctant to impose any inequitable taxes on law-abiding citizens of this country. I also agree with the President's recommendation that defense cannot be cut any further. The Frank substitute which proposes a \$2.4 billion cut to defense could unnecessarily jeopardize our national security.

The Kasich substitute reverses the change in priorities that Congress enacted in last year's budget and that the President has tried to further in his administration. This substitute proposes entitlement cuts of \$95.6 billion over 5 years. I agree that entitlement spending must be controlled if we are to balance our Nation's budget, but we cannot expect senior citizens on Medicare alone to restore our Nation's fiscal health.

The Kasich substitute cuts domestic spending by an additional \$282.4 billion over the next five years compared to the committee resolution. The effects to the 12th District of Illinois could be disastrous. The following domestic cuts will have a direct and substantial impact on southern and southwestern Illinois:

A 25-percent cut in energy development programs will end research and development of clean coal technologies. Future funding for the Clean Coal Technology Program is totally eliminated.

The reduction in highway and mass transit grants will make the St. Clair County extension of MetroLink impossible. Eliminating mass transit operating subsidies will impose a huge local tax burden and effectively shutdown MetroLink.

The elimination of campus-based student assistance programs such as work-study and Perkins loans will limit the educational opportunities of thousands of students enrolled at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.

The elimination of the entire impact aid program could easily bankrupt Mascoutah school district and other school districts impacted by a Federal presence.

The repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act will put local laborers out of work.

While a \$500 per child tax credit may be appealing at first thought, I cannot believe this is

responsible fiscal policy. Exploding budget deficits were brought under control by last year's deficit reduction legislation, but future deficits are still projected to be over \$160 billion per year. It is not realistic with this fiscal outlook to expect a massive tax cut. The 1981 Reagan income tax cut helped drive deficits out of control; this mistake should not be repeated at a time when our Federal budget deficit is headed down as the result of the Clinton plan.

Mr. Speaker, the committee-passed budget resolution is sound fiscal policy that cuts our Federal budget deficit and builds on changes in our national priorities. We must pass this budget to see the initiatives—such as crime control and job training—a chance to work. As a result of the enactment of the deficit reduction bill from last year, the deficit as a percentage of the economy is projected to drop from 4.9 percent in fiscal year 1992 down to 2.5 percent in fiscal year 1995—the lowest since 1979. This budget will help maintain these projections. I urge a vote in favor of the budget resolution and against the substitutes.

Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget resolution as reported by the House Budget Committee.

This budget is an important step in further reducing the Federal deficit. In fact, the budget will reduce the deficit an additional \$53 billion from the fiscal year 1994 budget. This represents a 23-percent reduction of the deficit in one fiscal year.

Much more remains to be done to cut unnecessary spending, and I look forward to working with my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, as the appropriations process continues, to find other areas to trim federal spending.

Mr. Chairman, I want to mention one other item. That is the importance of enacting a plan to bring health care costs under control, because under the current system the Federal deficit will rise in the out years due to uncontrolled health care spending. And so I also look forward to addressing the issue of health care costs with my colleagues and enacting meaningful reform.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 218, the fiscal year 1995 budget resolution, as passed by the Budget Committee. Last year the President offered and the Congress passed the largest deficit reduction package in the history of the United States. Today we have the opportunity to pass the second step in President Clinton's economic plan.

Mr. Chairman, many will rise today in opposition to the committee version. They will deny the great strides the economy is making under President Clinton's guidance. My home State of Texas has been a beneficiary of President Clinton's economic policy, as evident by the over 139,000 new jobs created in Texas last year.

Others will tout their budget alternatives as being more profamily and ask what the administration has done for the family. To them, I will say this: The Clinton plan provided a real profamily tax break by expanding the earned income tax credit for moderate-income families. This enabled those who need their money most, the working parents, to keep their money in their pocketbooks and out of the

Government coffers. In Texas, over 1.4 million people are now eligible for the tax credit. Over 48,000 families in my congressional district are eligible to receive this tax credit.

In light of the passage of the North American Free-Trade Agreement and its expected impact on the Southwest border region, I am encouraged by the Budget Committee's inclusion of the full amount of President Clinton's priority investment of \$300 million to enhance infrastructure and environmental protection in this region. I applaud the Committee's commitment to border infrastructure projects in the area of water and wastewater for colonias, initiation of the Commission for Environmental Cooperation, Border Environmental Cooperation Commission, and the North American Development Bank, surface transportation projects and health care projects.

This budget continues the fiscal restraint mandated in last year's 5-year deficit reduction package. It is a fair and reasonable measure and shows that we are serious about our resolve to reduce the deficit without diminishing our ability to fulfill our responsibilities to the American people. I urge my colleagues to reject all substitutes and to vote for the committee version.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. KASICH] and I have an agreement that we will yield this time back. But the leadership first wishes to make an announcement.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in an effort for everybody to catch their planes, we are not going to do the last 5 minutes or whatever it is. But there will be a recorded vote, so nobody should leave until we do that. But there will be no more talking. How about a cheer for that.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] the majority leader, to make an announcement.

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this moment to inform Members that there will not be further debate; we will go right to a vote on the budget. But following that vote there will be 4 minutes of debate before a vote to instruct on going to conference on the employee Federal buyout bill. So there will be an additional vote after the vote on the budget, but it will come very quickly.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MOAKLEY] having assumed the chair, Mr. SERRANO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Com-

mittee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 218) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998, and 1999, pursuant to House Resolution 384, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 223, noes 175, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 56]

AYES—223

Ackerman	Fazio	McCurdy
Andrews (ME)	Fields (LA)	McDermott
Applegate	Fliner	McHale
Bacchus (FL)	Fingerhut	McKinney
Baessler	Flake	McNulty
Barca	Foglietta	Menendez
Barcia	Ford (MI)	Mfume
Barlow	Frank (MA)	Mineta
Barrett (WI)	Frost	Minge
Becerra	Furse	Mink
Beilenson	Gedjenson	Moakley
Berman	Gephardt	Mollohan
Beverly	Geren	Montgomery
Bilbray	Glickman	Moran
Bishop	Gordon	Murphy
Blackwell	Green	Murtha
Bonior	Hall (OH)	Nadler
Borski	Hamburg	Neal (MA)
Boucher	Hamilton	Neal (NC)
Brewster	Harman	Oberstar
Browder	Hefner	Obey
Brown (CA)	Hilliard	Olver
Brown (FL)	Hinchey	Ortiz
Brown (OH)	Hoagland	Owens
Bryant	Hochbrueckner	Pallone
Byrne	Holden	Parker
Cantwell	Hoyer	Pastor
Cardin	Hughes	Payne (NJ)
Carr	Hutto	Payne (VA)
Chapman	Inslee	Peterson (FL)
Clay	Jefferson	Peterson (MN)
Clayton	Johnson (GA)	Pickle
Clement	Johnson (SD)	Pomeroy
Clyburn	Johnson, E. B.	Poshard
Coleman	Johnston	Price (NC)
Collins (MI)	Kanjorski	Rahall
Condit	Kaptur	Rangel
Conyers	Kennedy	Reed
Cooper	Kennelly	Richardson
Coppersmith	Kildee	Roemer
Costello	Kiecicka	Rose
Coyne	Klein	Rowland
Cramer	Klink	Roybal-Allard
Danner	Kreidler	Rush
Darden	LaFalce	Sabo
de la Garza	Lambert	Sanders
Deal	Lantos	Sangmeister
DeLauro	LaRocco	Sarpalius
Dellums	Laughlin	Sawyer
Derrick	Lehman	Schenk
Deutsch	Levin	Schroeder
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Schumer
Dingell	Lipinski	Scott
Dixon	Long	Serrano
Durbin	Lowey	Sharp
Edwards (CA)	Maloney	Shepherd
Edwards (TX)	Manton	Sisisky
Engel	Markey	Skaggs
English	Martinez	Skelton
Eshoo	Matsul	Slaughter
Evans	Mazoli	Smith (IA)
Farr	McCloskey	Spratt

Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thompson

Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torrice
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters

Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—175

Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Archer
Army
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bateman
Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crapo
Cunningham
DeFazio
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Galegally
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Girman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling

Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingalls
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lancaster
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Mann
Manzullo
Margolies
Mezvisinsky
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Molinar
Moorhead
Morella
Myers

Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Trafilant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—35

Abercrombie
Andrews (TX)
Ballenger
Barton
Brooks
Collins (IL)
Crane
Dooley
Fields (TX)
Ford (TN)
Gallo
Gibbons

Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Hastings
Hayes
Kopetski
Lewis (CA)
Lightfoot
Lloyd
McMillan
Meehan
Meek
Michel

Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Natcher
Orton
Pelosi
Reynolds
Rostenkowski
Shaw
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Towns

□ 1414

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rostenkowski for, with Mr. Crane against.

Mr. Abercrombie for, with Mr. Ballenger against.

Mr. Brooks for, with Mr. Barton, against.
Mrs. Collins of Illinois for, with Mr. Fields of Texas against.

Mr. Dooley for, with Mr. Gallo against.
Mrs. Lloyd for, with Mr. Lightfoot against.
Mr. Meehan for, with Mr. McMillan against.

Mr. Orton for, with Mr. Miller of Florida against.

Mr. Slattery for, with Mr. Shaw against.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota changed his vote from "no" to "aye."
So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous material in the RECORD on House Concurrent Resolution 218.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOAKLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3345, FEDERAL WORKFORCE RESTRUCTURING ACT OF 1994

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3345), to provide temporary authority to Government agencies relating to voluntary separation incentive payments, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments to the House amendment to the Senate amendment thereto, to disagree to the Senate amendments to the House amendment, and to agree to the conference requested by the Senate thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. CASTLE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk to read as follows:

Mr. CASTLE moves that the Managers on the part of the House, at the Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H.R. 3345), be instructed to agree to the amendment of the Senate numbered one, the Gramm amendment creating the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund and providing a conforming reduction in the discretionary spending limits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I will be very brief.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this is an important message that we need to understand. I would like to repeat the language of the motion to instruct conferees where, in part, we say, "Be instructed to agree to the amendment of the Senate, numbered one, the Gramm amendment, creating the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund and providing a conforming reduction in the discretionary spending limits."

This amendment just passed in the other body this morning by a 90-to-1 margin. If we do not pass this motion to instruct conferees, the savings generated by the buyout provisions in the buyout program could be spent virtually on anything.

Since the House has failed to pass the crime bill, this is necessary. If we are serious about addressing the crime problem and funding the crime bill, we simply must do this.

Please note, as was stated in the motion itself, that discretionary spending caps will be reduced by the same amount. It is very simple. It will take this money and put it into the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund. I think we are all virtually in agreement that that should be funded and this is the best mechanism by which to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct conferees. When this body initially passed H.R. 3345, we also adopted an amendment offered by Mr. PENNY, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. SOLOMON that reduces overall Federal employment by 252,000 positions. This provision will reduce overall Federal expenditures by at least \$22 billion. It is now being proposed that before we even enact those savings we commit to spending them. In effect, we are being asked to create a budgetary straight-jacket in order to fund a trust fund to support a legislative initiative that has never been approved or even considered by this body. In effect, we are being asked to write a new definition of fiscal irresponsibility.

As passed by the House, H.R. 3345 does not spend one dime of the savings created by the reduction of the Federal work force. Decisions will be made as to whether those savings should be committed to deficit reduction, to fighting crime, to improving education, and/or to protecting the national defense. Those decisions will be made when the Congress adopts this year's budget resolution and will be refined later in the appropriations bills and future budget resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, this dispute over the allocation of the savings is jeopardizing our ability to ensure that the Government work force is reduced in the most

humane and cost-effective manner possible, without unnecessarily firing Federal employees. Failure to enact this legislation will force involuntary separations at a greater cost to the taxpayers. The dispute over how to spend the savings will inevitably delay and perhaps prevent enactment of the legislation. I urge that the motion to instruct conferees be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to the gentleman on the other side of the aisle with respect to the point that we have not addressed the crime issue over here, have not created a trust fund, and so forth. The point is the time to get this thing reserved is now in the budget process. We will not have the money reserved for when we do need it and do pass out our bill in a couple of weeks, if we do not have a protective device through this budget process. So I think the vote on the motion to instruct is very meaningful, very important, very straightforward.

□ 1420

Mr. Speaker, we are going to have the funds necessary to deal with the war on crime when we do get around to finishing our part in the next couple of weeks. We need to vote for the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOAKLEY). The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 150, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

AYES—231

Allard	Bilbray	Castle
Andrews (NJ)	Bishop	Chapman
Archer	Bliley	Clement
Armey	Blute	Clinger
Bachus (AL)	Boehlert	Coble
Baker (CA)	Bonilla	Collins (GA)
Baker (LA)	Brewster	Combest
Barca	Browder	Cooper
Barcia	Bryant	Costello
Barrett (NE)	Bunning	Cox
Bartlett	Burton	Cramer
Bateman	Buyer	Crapo
Bentley	Calvert	Cunningham
Bereuter	Camp	Danner
Berman	Canady	Darden
Bevill	Cantwell	de la Garza

Deal	Kaptur	Ramstad
DeFazio	Kasich	Ravenel
DeLay	Kennelly	Reed
Diaz-Balart	Kim	Regula
Dickey	King	Ridge
Doollittle	Klein	Roberts
Dornan	Klug	Roemer
Dreier	Knollenberg	Rogers
Duncan	Kolbe	Rohrabacher
Dunn	Kyl	Ros-Lehtinen
Edwards (TX)	Lambert	Roth
Emerson	Lancaster	Roukema
Engel	LaRocco	Royce
English	Lazio	Sangmeister
Everett	Leach	Santorum
Ewing	Lehman	Sarpalilus
Fingerhut	Levin	Saxton
Fish	Levy	Schaefer
Fowler	Lewis (FL)	Schenk
Franks (CT)	Linder	Schiff
Franks (NJ)	Livingston	Schumer
Frost	Lowey	Sensenbrenner
Furse	Machtley	Shepherd
Galleghy	Maloney	Shuster
Gejdenson	Manzullo	Skeen
Gekas	McCandless	Skelton
Geren	McCormack	Smith (IA)
Gilchrist	McCrery	Smith (MI)
Gillmor	McCurdy	Smith (NJ)
Gingrich	McDade	Smith (OR)
Glickman	McHale	Smith (TX)
Goodlatte	McHugh	Snowe
Goodling	McInnis	Spence
Goss	McKeon	Spratt
Grams	Meyers	Stearns
Grandy	Mica	Stenholm
Greenwood	Michel	Stump
Gunderson	Molinari	Stupak
Hall (TX)	Mollohan	Talent
Hancock	Montgomery	Tanner
Hansen	Moorhead	Tauzin
Harman	Neal (NC)	Taylor (MS)
Hastert	Nussle	Thomas (CA)
Hefley	Oxley	Thomas (WY)
Herger	Packard	Torkildsen
Hobson	Pallone	Torricelli
Hoekstra	Parker	Trafficant
Hoke	Paxon	Valentine
Horn	Payne (VA)	Vucanovich
Houghton	Peterson (FL)	Walker
Huffington	Peterson (MN)	Walsh
Hughes	Petri	Waxman
Hunter	Pickle	Weldon
Hutchinson	Pombo	Whitten
Hutto	Pomeroy	Wilson
Hyde	Porter	Wise
Inglis	Portman	Wyden
Inhofe	Poshard	Young (AK)
Istook	Pryce (OH)	Young (FL)
Johnson (CT)	Quinn	Zeliff
Johnson, Sam	Rahall	Zimmer

NOES—150

Ackerman	Dingell	Jefferson
Andrews (ME)	Dixon	Johnson (SD)
Applegate	Durbin	Johnson, E. B.
Bacchus (FL)	Edwards (CA)	Johnston
Baessler	Ehlers	Kanjorski
Barlow	Eshoo	Kennedy
Barrett (WI)	Evans	Kildee
Becerra	Farr	Kleczka
Beilenson	Fawell	Klink
Blackwell	Fazio	Kreidler
Bonior	Fields (LA)	Lantos
Borski	Filner	Laughlin
Boucher	Flake	Lewis (GA)
Brown (CA)	Foglietta	Long
Brown (FL)	Ford (MI)	Mann
Brown (OH)	Frank (MA)	Manton
Byrne	Gephardt	Margolies-
Cardin	Gilman	Mezvisinsky
Carr	Gonzalez	Markey
Clay	Gordon	Martinez
Clayton	Hall (OH)	Matsui
Clyburn	Hamburg	Mazzoli
Coleman	Hamilton	McCloskey
Collins (MI)	Hefner	McDermott
Condit	Hilliard	McKinney
Conyers	Hinchey	Meek
Coppersmith	Hoagland	Menendez
Coyne	Hochbrueckner	Mfume
DeLauro	Holden	Mineta
Dellums	Hoyer	Minge
Deutsch	Inslee	Mink
Dicks	Jacobs	Moakley

Moran	Sabo	Thurman
Morella	Sanders	Torres
Murphy	Sawyer	Tucker
Myers	Schroeder	Unsoeld
Nadler	Scott	Upton
Neal (MA)	Serrano	Velazquez
Oberstar	Sharp	Vento
Obey	Shays	Visclosky
Oliver	Slaughter	Volkmer
Ortiz	Stark	Washington
Pastor	Stokes	Waters
Payne (NJ)	Strickland	Wheat
Penny	Studds	Williams
Pickett	Swett	Wolf
Price (NC)	Swift	Woolsey
Rangel	Synar	Wynn
Richardson	Tejeda	Yates
Roybal-Allard	Thompson	
Rush	Thornton	

NOT VOTING—52

Abercrombie	Hastings	Owens
Andrews (TX)	Hayes	Pelosi
Ballenger	Johnson (GA)	Quillen
Barton	Kingston	Reynolds
Bilirakis	Kopetski	Rose
Boehner	LaFalce	Rostenkowski
Brooks	Lewis (CA)	Rowland
Callahan	Lightfoot	Shaw
Collins (IL)	Lipinski	Sisisky
Crane	Lloyd	Skaggs
Derrick	McMillan	Slattery
Dooley	McNulty	Solomon
Fields (TX)	Meehan	Sundquist
Ford (TN)	Miller (CA)	Taylor (NC)
Gallo	Miller (FL)	Towns
Gibbons	Murtha	Watt
Green	Natcher	
Gutierrez	Orton	

□ 1440

The Clerk announced the following pair:

Mr. Bilirakis for, with Mr. Meehan against.

Messrs. FAWELL, MARKEY, and HOAGLAND changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. BEVILL, BROWDER, POMEROY, and BISHOP changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Without objection the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for consideration of the Senate amendments to the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, and Mrs. MORELLA.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of Senate amendment numbered 1 and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BROOKS, SCHUMER, and SENSENBRENNER.

From the Committee on Government Operations, for consideration of Senate amendment numbered 1 and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CONYERS, TOWNS, and CLINGER.

From the Committee on Rules, for consideration of Senate amendment numbered 1 and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DERRICK, BEILSON, and SOLOMON.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I missed rollcall vote 56, final passage of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1994. I am opposed to the House Democratic budget plan and was "paired no" on this vote. I also missed roll call vote 57 instructing conferees on H.R. 3345 on the Gramm amendment creating the violent crime reduction trust fund. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall No. 57 on H.R. 3345, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of ascertaining the legislative program, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, obviously votes are finished for today. There will be no votes on Monday, March 14. On Tuesday, March 15, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for Morning Hour. The House will then meet at noon for three bills on suspension, H.R. 2815, Farmington Wild and Scenic Rivers Act; S. 375, Rio Grande Designation Act of 1994; and H.R. 1933, The King Holiday and Service Act of 1994. Recorded votes on these suspensions will be postponed until Wednesday, March 16.

On Wednesday, the House will meet at 10. However, I would say to Members, there will not be a vote until after 11. It could be right at 11 or right after 11. If there is a vote on the Journal, it will be rolled or postponed until after 11. There could be a vote on a rule at about that time on the balanced budget amendment, House Joint Resolution 103.

The other matters that could be brought up on Thursday, and possibly Friday, are S. 636, a motion to go to conference on the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act, and H.R. 6, the elementary and secondary education amendments of 1993.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I wonder whether the majority leader could postpone the votes on Wednesday until later than 11, because we will be coming back from Chicago. We have a primary on Tuesday. The votes will not come in until 8. There are no planes that we can take.

In the past, the majority leader has set votes for 4 or 5 o'clock in deference to the problems of those who had primaries. I wonder whether we could do that in this instance?

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, our problem is it is not possible to roll the vote on the rule on the balanced budget amendment. It may be that no one will call for a vote on the balanced budget amendment rule, but we have to have a rule in place before we can proceed with the debate.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, if I might comment from our side, and this is obviously not a guarantee to Members, but my understanding is that no one at the present time sees a vital need that would be served by getting a vote on the rule. We would certainly on a bipartisan basis try to avoid any vote that early. I would say this to my friend from Chicago [Mr. YATES], although Members' rights are protected and we cannot guarantee that a member will not ask for a vote.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that assurance. I understand the dilemma of the majority leader. I hope no vote is called for.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make one comment and ask one question about Friday. I do want to note for our colleagues that I believe on Wednesday, and I appreciate very much the cooperation that the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Oregon have given us in trying to arrange the schedule so everything can work right, but I think we will have the first of the Oxford debates that have been commented on.

I mention that because I think in terms of establishing for the country what the House does and how it operates, that this will be a useful thing. It is not formally on the schedule, but I do think it is a good thing for us to be trying to do.

I did not know if the majority leader wanted to comment on that before I ask about the Friday schedule.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, in a moment I will ask unanimous consent to establish the procedure that we will use in those debates. But his will be the first of such debates. There will be two to follow, at least. We hope they will continue after that. It will be a 90-minute debate under Oxford style rules, and the debaters will be on C-SPAN during that debate period. It is a first for the House, and I think it will be a very positive experience.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I understand that while I was out of the room trying to get something arranged here on the floor, it was agreed there would be no staff on the floor at all for either side. So this will be a genuine test of whether or not Members can in fact function in a staffless environment. Some of our colleagues may watch just to see how rusty we are at doing this purely on our own.

Mr. GEPHARDT. We feel it is much more likely to be a success in this body than in the other body.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, without in any way commenting on the other body, which would be so inappropriate under our rules, let me say my one question is, there is some talk we might possibly not have votes on Friday. I did not know if the majority knew what the status of Friday was.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is our hope there will be no votes on Friday. We will try to make that call as early in the week as we can so Members can plan.

ADHERING TO FORMAT AND SEQUENCE FOR STRUCTURED DEBATES IN RECOGNITION OF MEMBERS BY THE SPEAKER

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in conferring recognition for structured debates on certain Wednesdays pursuant to the previous order of the House of February 11, 1994, the Speaker may adhere to a format and sequence mutually established by the majority leader and the minority leader of their designees and depicted in a memorandum at the Speaker's desk and at each manager's table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 1994

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, March 15, 1994.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

HOOR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, MARCH 16, 1994

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, March 15, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, March 16, 1994.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CERTAIN BUSINESS IN ORDER AND PROVIDING GUIDELINES FOR CONSIDERATION OF BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order pursuant to clause 3 of rule XXVII (27) on Monday, March 14, 1994, be dispensed with, and that it be in order on Wednesday, March 16 for Representatives STENHOLM or his designee to call up House Resolution 331 for consideration under the same terms as if discharged from the Committee on Rules pursuant to clause 3 of rule XXVII.

Further, I ask unanimous consent that the period of general debate provided for in House Resolution 331 be reduced to 6 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Representative BROOKS of Texas, Representative FISH of New York, and Representative STENHOLM of Texas, or their designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I do so merely to clarify the order of business on Wednesday and Thursday with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. Speaker, I understand that when the House meets next Wednesday at 10 o'clock, the first order of business will be the discussion of the rule on the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution for 1 hour. Following that, assuming passage of the rule, there will then be 6 hours of debate, as described in the unanimous-consent request by the gentleman from Texas.

Following general debate on Wednesday evening, there will be a 1-hour debate on the Kyl substitute, followed by a vote on the Kyl substitute. On Thursday, in a continuation of the balanced budget amendment debate, I assume at 10 o'clock Thursday morning the House will consider the Barton substitute for 1 hour, the Wise-Price-Pomeroy substitute for 1 hour, and, finally, the Stenholm-Smith balanced budget amendment offering for 1 hour, followed by a motion to recommit, and then a vote on final passage.

□ 1450

Does the gentleman from Texas understand that this is correct, or does he have suggestions for this amendment?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the understanding of what we agreed to. And in answer to the request of the gentleman from Illinois regarding the rule vote, it is not the intention of anyone on this side of the

aisle to ask for a vote on the rule. I believe it has been expressed the same way from the gentleman's side of the aisle, and the schedule he has outlined is the procedure we will be following.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, that is correct. We have no plans to ask for a vote on the rule between the two of us. No one that I know will ask for a vote on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL PUBLIC SAFETY TELECOMMUNICATORS WEEK

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 56) to designate the week beginning April 12, 1993, as "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY] who is the chief sponsor of this resolution to explain the resolution.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 56, to designate the week of April 11, 1994, as "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week." I am pleased to announce today that 224 of my colleagues join me in support of this resolution to recognize the thousands of public safety officers and employees whose job it is to coordinate, dispatch, and facilitate the execution of law enforcement and emergency response activities in all of our districts.

Each day, Americans place over one million calls to 911 services. That one million is multiplied two to three fold in instances of emergency. The natural disasters that swept the United States this past year, from the floods in the Midwest, to the brush fires and the earthquake in California, to the blizzards that flailed the northeast, commanded the conscientious efforts of the public safety workers more than ever. In order for emergency services to respond promptly, public safety telecommunicators swiftly and efficiently direct appropriate law enforcement, medical rescue, and firefighting teams where they are needed. The daily regimen of these public safety officers is filled with life-or-death situations to which they must respond calmly, confidently, and with utmost precision. And though untold numbers of Ameri-

cans owe their lives to their heroic efforts, public safety telecommunicators are rarely in the limelight. Rather, these dedicated individuals work behind the scenes, with little public recognition of the tremendous value of their service.

National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week not only heightens public awareness of the life-saving communications services provided by public safety telecommunicators, but also recognizes the leadership of the Association of Public Safety Communications Officers [APCO] in ensuring the continued quality of these services. With a national membership of 9,000 public safety telecommunicators, APCO is a unified voice for the public safety community in advising Federal, State and local government agencies on ways to improve emergency response systems. The Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, which I chair, has benefited from APCO's input on a number of important issues, ranging from spectrum allocation to telephone privacy to the information superhighway legislation currently going through committee. I look forward to APCO's continued input in these, and other important matters in the future.

Moreover, as we advance further into the information age, emerging communications technologies will increase tremendously the lifesaving capabilities of public safety telecommunicators. The emergency telecommunications systems of the future will incorporate new technologies such as digital mapping, solar powered cellular public rescue phones, and E-911 which will permit dispatchers to respond to emergency calls with greater speed and precision. Judging by their past performance, APCO and public safety telecommunicators will be on the cutting edge in employing these new technologies and services to save lives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in expressing our enduring appreciation and gratitude to those men and women whose efforts have long gone above and beyond the call of duty.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 138, the House counterpart to Senate Joint Resolution 56, and as a Member of the congressional fire services caucus, it is my pleasure to rise in support of this legislation to designate the week beginning April 12, 1994, as National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week.

Public safety telecommunicators are the driving force behind our Nation's emergency rescue services. They are the men and women who dispatch our police forces, our ambulances, our firefighters. Although they are not as visi-

ble as the men and women who arrive at the scene of emergencies, they are just as important.

We depend upon public safety telecommunicators to notify emergency personnel promptly, clear, and calmly. We depend upon them to keep our spouses and our children calm and assured in an emergency. We depend upon them for guidance and support in our most frantic moments.

Mr. Speaker, some of us have been lucky enough not to have had to dial 911 in the middle of a fire, a robbery, or a medical emergency. But for the millions of Americans who have faced such an emergency, public safety telecommunicators have been there—ready and willing to help. It is, indeed, fitting that we take time to recognize their invaluable contribution to our daily lives, and I am very pleased to support the designation of the week beginning April 12, 1994, as National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] for her eloquent words.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senate Joint Resolution 56 to designate the week beginning April 12, 1993, as "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week." I thank my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. MARKEY], for his initiative in presenting this resolution for our consideration.

This resolution commemorates the more than one-half million men and women across the country who are engaged in the operation of emergency response systems for Federal, State, and local governments. These dedicated men and women are responsible for saving lives and property during times of crisis with their countless efforts in assisting the citizens of our Nation by dispatching to respond to emergencies, local fires, police, and safety personnel.

It is important to note that many of our telecommunicators provide calls for assistance relating to other important matters, such as forestry and conservation operations, highway safety and maintenance activities, and other pertinent governmental functions.

Accordingly, I strongly support this joint resolution in recognition of the outstanding services provided by our safety telecommunicators throughout our Nation and local communities.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 56

Whereas over one-half million dedicated men and women are engaged in the operation of emergency response systems for Federal,

State, and local governmental entities throughout the United States.

Whereas these individuals are responsible for responding to the telephone calls of the general public for police, fire and emergency medical assistance and for dispatching such assistance to help save the lives and property of our citizens;

Whereas such calls include not only police, fire and emergency medical service calls but those governmental communications related to forestry and conservation operations, highway safety and maintenance activities, and all of the other operations which modern governmental agencies must conduct; and

Whereas America's public safety telecommunications daily serve the public in countless ways without due recognition by the beneficiaries of their services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning April 12, 1993, is hereby designated as "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYNN

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WYNN: Page 2, line 3, strike "April 12, 1993," and insert "April 11, 1994."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT TO THE TITLE OFFERED BY MR. WYNN

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the title offered by Mr. WYNN:

In the title, strike "April 12, 1993," and insert "April 11, 1994."

The amendment to the title was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLASSICAL MUSIC MONTH

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 239) to authorize the President to proclaim September 1994 as Classical Music Month, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], who

is the chief sponsor of House Joint Resolution 239.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I think this is an important resolution. The people of our country love classical music. In designating the month of November 1994 as a month in which classical music is recognized for the greatest that it has, I think the House does honor to itself as well.

I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland for bringing the joint resolution up and for seeing that it is passed.

Mr. Speaker, classical music warms our hearts, makes us think, and lifts our spirits. It appeals to people of all ages in every part of the country and I think it is important to set aside some time, as we do with this resolution, to salute the musicians, the recording companies, the schools of music, the orchestras, and the various musical groups that perform this music as well as the people of this country that support and enjoy classical music.

Classical music, which we celebrate and honor with the passage of House Joint Resolution 239, is a source of tremendous pleasure to millions of Americans. I am delighted to have had the opportunity to introduce this resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the month of September as Classical Music Month and I look forward to the events that will take place all across the country during September.

I am most grateful to my 249 colleagues who joined me in this effort and I extend my personal thanks to Chairman CLAY and his committee for bringing the bill to the floor today.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I merely wish to add my support to the gentleman's resolution.

I urge my colleagues to fully support the measure.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 239

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating September 1993 as "Classical Music Month" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such a month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNITION OF PARENTS DAY

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 236) to declare

that July 28, 1994, be recognized as Parents Day, and ask for its immediate consideration.

□ 1500

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but would simply like to inform the House the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for yielding to me.

Normally I would not read a resolution. This is very short, but I think it is very, very important. I would like to read it for my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, this is "To declare that July 28, 1994, be recognized as Parents Day.

Whereas the values of sacrificial love and integrity are fundamental in developing the moral character essential to maintaining a strong nation;

Whereas parents by their example of sacrificial love and the transmission of moral and cultural values play a crucial and determinant role in the development of youth;

Whereas time has demonstrated that the traditional American family is the most stable and secure environment in which parents can successfully rear future generations;

Whereas the current breakdown of the traditional American family is a major factor contributing to the rise of crime, teen pregnancy, educational failure, substance abuse, and suicide among our Nation's youth;

Whereas it is in the interest of society and government to adopt policies, that help families stay together by strengthening and sustaining fathers and mothers in fulfilling their parental roles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That on Parents Day, July 28, 1994, all private citizens, organizations and governmental and legislative bodies at the local, State and Federal level are encouraged to recognize this day through proclamations, activities and educational efforts in the furtherance of recognizing, uplifting and supporting the role of parents in the rearing of their children.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal was brought to my attention by the National Parent's Day Coalition, and it is a bipartisan, multiracial organization consisting of ministers and lay people from across this country who are very concerned about the deterioration of the moral fiber of this country and the deterioration of the family.

Among those who are cochairmen is a former colleague of ours, the Honorable Walter Fauntroy, who represented the District of Columbia in the Congress, and he is now a pastor here in Washington; Dr. Robert G. Grant, who is a national cochairman; Dr. D. James

Kennedy, also a great theologian; Dr. Joseph Lowery; Dr. Cecil Murray; and a former colleague of ours, the Honorable Bob Wilson.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend them and all the other people who have been active in this organization for their efforts to try to bring to the attention of the American people and governmental units across this country the importance of preserving and furthering the values we all hold so dear that made this country what it is today.

Above the lectern it says, "In God We Trust." Sometimes I wonder if that is sometimes still our theme, because of the way our country is headed.

This National Parent's Day coalition is going to try to put moral values and religious principles back into the families, to perpetuate the way the family is, to let the country know how important the family is, and to give parents a pat on the back for the hard work they have put forth in raising children in a very difficult period in our country's history.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank my colleague for yielding, and thank my colleague on the other side of the aisle for his support on this resolution, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD this letter urging cosponsorship of National Parent's Day:

NATIONAL PARENT'S DAY COALITION.

Tantallon, MD, October 21, 1993.

Hon. PHIL CRANE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRANE: I am writing you on behalf of the Co-Chairmen of the National Parent's Day Coalition who join with me in urging you to cosponsor H. Res. 236, a resolution introduced by Rep. Dan Burton to proclaim July 28, 1994 as Parent's Day (copy enclosed). In addition to myself, the other Co-Chairmen of our coalition are Dr. Cecil Murray, Pastor of the First AME Church of Los Angeles, Dr. D. James Kennedy, Pastor of Coral Ridge Ministries, Dr. Joseph Lowery, President of the SCLC, and former representatives Bob Wilson (R-CA) and Walter Fauntroy (D-DC). We are a bipartisan, multiracial and interfaith coalition with members in all 50 states.

As we build toward implementing many activities and events to coincide with Parent's Day, we will be sure to prominently mention your name as a key cosponsor of this resolution. Your support and leadership in this endeavor will be greatly appreciated by our many supporters in your district.

Already, more than 42 Democrats and Republicans have agreed to cosponsor H. Res. 236 (see enclosed list). We hope you will join with your colleagues in adding your name to this important resolution.

I understand that a number of your constituents have already written to you in support of this. In the near future, one of our coalition's volunteer coordinators will contact your office to follow up on the above request. We look forward to your joining with us in support of this endeavor to recognize and support parents.

Thanking you in advance for your thoughtful consideration of the above and wishing you God's richest blessings,
I remain,

ROBERT G. GRANT, Ph.D.,
National Co-Chairman.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for bringing this measure to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 236

Whereas the values of sacrificial love and integrity are fundamental in developing the moral character essential to maintaining a strong Nation;

Whereas parents by their example of sacrificial love and the transmission of moral and cultural values play a crucial and determinant role in the development of youth;

Whereas time has demonstrated that the traditional American family is the most stable and secure environment in which parents can successfully rear future generations;

Whereas the current breakdown of the traditional American family is a major factor contributing to the rise of crime, teen pregnancy, educational failure, substance abuse, and suicide among our Nation's youth; and

Whereas it is in the interest of society and government to adopt policies, that help families stay together by strengthening and sustaining fathers and mothers in fulfilling their parental roles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That on Parents Day, July 28, 1994, all private citizens, organizations and governmental and legislative bodies at the local, State and Federal level are encouraged to recognize this day through proclamations, activities and educational efforts in the furtherance of recognizing, uplifting and supporting the role of parents in the rearing of their children.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 162) designating March 25, 1994, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but I would just simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to rise to speak on the occasion of this commemorative which marks a day of tremendous historical significance for Americans and all who revere the blessings which a democratic way of life have afforded us. On March 25, Greece will celebrate the 173d anniversary of its declaration of independence from foreign domination. We revere and honor the contribution that Greek civilization has made to the democratic tradition.

The cause of Greek independence and the adherence of the Greek nation to the path of democracy and true respect for the will of the people to determine their political course has always been dear to the hearts of democrats—and I say that word with a small d—everywhere. We remember that the great romantic poet Lord Byron gave his life for this cause during the tumultuous revolt of the Greeks against their Ottoman overlords. The cause of democracy in Greece continues to be a matter of interest and concern for us here today.

In particular, we in America are gratified by Greece's role as a close American ally, the contribution that the Greek-American community makes to this country—and we only have to look around this Chamber to see our Members of Greek heritage with whom I know we are all proud to serve—and Greece's role in Europe, where it now holds the important position as the President of the European Union.

I hope that all Members of this House will join me in sponsoring the resolution of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], House Joint Resolution 310, which commemorates Greek Independence Day, and I applaud that gentleman for his efforts in this cause.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, as the principal sponsor of the House companion measure to this bill, I would like to express my deep gratitude particularly to Chairman SAWYER of the Census and Population Subcommittee for bringing this measure to the floor in such an expeditious manner.

I would also like to thank JOHN MYERS, ranking Republican on that subcommittee, and Chairman CLAY of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in this regard.

March 25 is a very special day to Greek-Americans and those who practice the Greek Orthodox faith—as well as freedom-loving people everywhere, really. This year, it marks both the 173d anniversary of the independence of Greece and its role as the wellspring of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, it is a magnificent thing to see so many people the world over turning to democratic movements in the wake of fallen or overthrown dictatorships and tyrannies. The practice of democratic government, first seen in Athens in 510 B.C., is being sought out and implemented around the world, expanding the frontier of freedom farther and farther every day.

Those democratic movements owe a great debt of gratitude to the ancient Greeks such as Aristotle and Polybius, who were democ-

rary's pioneers, as do we here in this Nation. I am never more proud of my own Greek heritage—or of being an American—than on days such as this one.

As those ancient Greeks forged the very notion of democracy, placing the ultimate power to govern in the hands of the people themselves, the spirit of March 25, Greek Independence Day, lives on in its defense. Over the course of history, many of the free world's people have given their lives in that defense.

I thank all of the colleagues here today for passing this legislation in commemoration of the democratic heritage that all of us share and which is shared by the United States and Greece.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 162

Whereas the ancient Greeks developed the concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern was vested in the people;

Whereas the Founding Fathers of the United States drew heavily upon the political experience and philosophy of ancient Greece in forming the representative democracy of the United States;

Whereas these and other ideals have forged a close bond both between the United States and Greece and between their peoples;

Whereas March 25, 1994, marks the 173rd anniversary of the beginning of the revolution that freed Greek people from the Ottoman Empire and enabled the reestablishment of democracy in Greece; and

Whereas it is proper and desirable to celebrate that anniversary with the Greek people and to reaffirm the democratic principles from which the United States and Greece were born: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That March 25, 1994, is designated as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 163) to proclaim March 20, 1994, as "National Agriculture Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not object, but

I would simply like to inform the House the minority has no objection to the legislation being considered.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in support of the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 163, to proclaim March 20, 1994 as National Agriculture Day.

National Agriculture Day has been observed annually for the past 21 years. It is quite simply a day set aside for our Nation to commemorate the many and important contributions of American agriculture to our Nation's economy and our individual lives.

How important is American agriculture today?

American agriculture is the economic foundation of not only rural America, but urban America. It is the source of the food that all of us rely on each and every day for sustenance and the fiber that clothes our bodies. American agriculture is the starting point for our Nation's enormous food and fiber sector which accounts for 16 percent of our Nation's GNP and 23 million jobs.

American agriculture is the steward of the lion's share of our Nation's privately held soil and water resources, a responsibility that our Nation's farmers and ranchers take very seriously because sustainable use of resources is absolutely necessary to their future.

American agriculture is the world's most efficient and diverse producer of food, enabling American consumers to be the best-fed people in the history of the world for the least amount of disposable income, and through its exports contributing to a more favorable balance of trade for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the designation of March 20 as National Agriculture Day will—at least in a small way—increase the public's awareness of the role of American agriculture, our Nation's largest industry.

This resolution allows our Nation to collectively say thank you to all the men and women involved in American agriculture. I appreciate the support and cooperation of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and Chairman Clay in bringing up the resolution, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] for managing the bill today.

I also want to say thank you to all of my colleagues here in the House who joined as cosponsors of House Joint Resolution 317, making it possible for us to consider the Senate companion today. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the assistance of Debbie Smith of the House Agriculture Committee staff who was instrumental in shepherding this resolution through the necessary legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 163.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 163

Whereas agriculture is the Nation's largest and most basic industry, and its associated production, processing, and marketing segments together provide more jobs than any other single industry;

Whereas the United States agricultural sector serves all Americans by providing food, fiber, and other basic necessities of life;

Whereas the performance of the agricultural economy is vital to maintaining the strength of our national economy, the standard of living of our citizens, and our presence in the world trade markets;

Whereas the Nation's heritage of family-owned, family-operated farms and ranches has been the core of the American agricultural system and continues to be the best means for assuring the protection of our natural resources and the production of an adequate and affordable supply of food and fiber for future generations of Americans;

Whereas the American agricultural system provides American consumers with a stable supply of the highest quality food and fiber for the lowest cost per capita in the world;

Whereas American agriculture continually seeks to maintain and improve the high level of product quality and safety expected by the consumer;

Whereas the public should be aware of the contributions of all people—men and women—who are a part of American agriculture and its contributions to American life, health, and prosperity;

Whereas women play a vital role in maintaining the family farm system, both as sole operators and as working partners, and are also attaining important leadership roles throughout the American agricultural system;

Whereas farm workers are an indispensable part of the agricultural system as witnessed by their hard work and dedication;

Whereas scientists and researchers play an integral part in the agricultural system in their search for better and more efficient ways to produce and process safe and nutritious agricultural products;

Whereas farmers and food processors are responding to the desire of health-conscious American consumers by developing more health-oriented food products;

Whereas distributors play an important role in transporting agricultural products to retailers who in turn make the products available to the consumer;

Whereas our youth—the future of our Nation—have become involved through various organizations in increasing their understanding and our understanding of the importance of agriculture in today's society;

Whereas it is important that all Americans should understand the role that agriculture plays in their lives and well-being, whether they live in urban or rural areas; and

Whereas since 1973, the first day of spring has been celebrated as National Agriculture Day by farmers and ranchers, commodity and farm organizations, cooperatives and agribusiness organizations, nonprofit and community organizations, other persons involved in the agricultural system, and Federal, State, and local governments: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That March 20, 1994, is proclaimed "National Agriculture Day", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities during the week of March 14 through March 20.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the various resolutions just considered and passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF THE CONGRESSIONAL AWARD BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable ROBERT H. MICHEL, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 11, 1994.

Hon. THOMAS FOLEY,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 4 of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 803), I hereby appoint Mr. Thomas D. Campbell of Alexandria, Virginia to serve as a member of the Congressional Award Board.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Republican Leader.

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following additional conferees on H.R. 1804:

As additional conferees from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of title XII of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DINGELL, WAXMAN, SYNAR, MOORHEAD, and BLILEY.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of section 921 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. HAMILTON, BERMAN, LANTOS, GILMAN, and Ms. SNOWE.

Further, and without objection, the Chair will insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a correction in the previous appointment of conferees on H.R. 1804 on February 23, 1994:

From the Committee on Education and Labor, for consideration of the House amendment (except title II) to the Senate amendment, and the Senate amendment (except sections 901-14), and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. FORD of Michigan, KILDEE, MILLER of California, SAWYER, and OWENS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. REED and Mr. ROEMER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Messrs. ENGEL, BECERRA, and GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Messrs. STRICKLAND, PAYNE of New Jersey, ROMERO-BARCELÓ, GOODLING, GUNDERSON, MCKEON, and PETRI, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr.

CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. ROUKEMA, and Mr. BOEHNER.

From the Committee on Education and Labor, for consideration of title II of the House amendment to the Senate amendment, and sections 901-14 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. FORD of Michigan, OWENS, PAYNE of New Jersey, SCOTT, SAWYER, GOODLING, BALLENGER, BARRETT of Nebraska, and FAWELL.

There was no objection.

NISSAN VAN OWNERS LOSE OUT

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, Nissan Motor Corp. in the United States recently announced a buy-back of their flawed 1987-1990 C-22 minivans and, the settlement of a 1-day California class action lawsuit which provides every van owner with a \$500 coupon.

What was not clear in the announcement nor in newspaper reports of the buy-back, was the fact that the van owners waive their right for further actions against Nissan if—if they accept the \$500 couple offer. Before March 22, 1994, van owners must notify the California superior court of their intention to be excluded from the California lawsuit.

Nissan's buy-back literature states the company "is undertaking this unprecedented program because we are concerned about your satisfaction." What crocodile tears. It has taken 6 years and 156 van fires to force this vehicle off the road.

The van owners are the victims in this sordid affair. Potentially they lose their rights as well as their money while the California attorneys made \$1.5 million on the lawsuit. This is not justice.

□ 1510

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

DR. JOHN B. COLEMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the State of Texas suffered a great loss over the weekend with the passing of Dr. John B. Coleman, a great friend and mentor to scores of Democratic politicians.

As Democrats throughout Texas all know, Dr. Coleman was more than a great physician and successful entrepreneur. He was the kind of friend, community servant, and philanthropist that made Texas extremely proud to call him a native son.

On behalf of my colleagues from Texas, I am deeply honored to share with this body the memory of a man who contributed so very much to Democratic politics, and principles. His quiet leadership, and his political activism without regard for personal gain, will ensure that his memory will live forever in the minds and hearts of every freedom loving Texan.

Dr. Coleman was a man of great conscience, whose legacy will long be felt even beyond the borders of Texas. Dr. Coleman lived daily what he preached. His relentless support of black American and other minority candidates, and his devotion to the minority community, while choosing to stay out of the limelight of politics, will leave a void that will be difficult to fill.

My Democratic colleagues would remind me that Dr. Coleman's support was not limited to black American politicians. Ask any of the previous mayors of the city of Houston, or the governor of Texas. He constantly sought out candidates whose moral fiber comported with his own strict standards, whether they were black American or not. In short, he put his money where his mouth was.

When Dr. Coleman finished medical school and returned to his native Houston in 1962, most hospitals would not allow him to practice. Nor could he eat at the local diners, or play golf with other doctors at the local country clubs. A man of impressive patience and enduring character, he thereafter devoted his life to chipping away at the prohibitions against black patronage of hotels, theaters, and other businesses.

Dr. Coleman epitomized independence and self-sufficiency, and encouraged other black Americans to practice the same. His black-owned radio station has been one of the most influential voices of the black community.

In education, Dr. Coleman was an impassioned and devoted leader. He was one of the first black Americans to be appointed by a Texas Governor to the board of regents of the prestigious Texas A&M University. He also served with pride on board of regents of Texas Southern University, and chairman of the board of the United Negro College Fund.

For black Americans everywhere, John B. Coleman leaves behind a legacy of pride and inspiration.

For the State of Texas, Dr. Coleman was the embodiment of good politics, and good citizenship. As a number of Texas legislators have said, "he didn't look at the outcome of a political race for himself, but what was good for the community."

I sincerely believe that the State of Texas is a better place to live because of the life-long community efforts of Dr. John B. Coleman.

JAPANESE TRADE PRACTICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland, Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, in some instances it seems very appropriate—and most enjoyable, I admit, to say, I told you so. After almost 10 years of coming to this floor week after week hammering on the unfair trading practices of Japan, it is very gratifying to have so much evidence being presented by this Government that I was neither crying wolf, nor "Jap bashing."

The recently completed joint study by the Japanese Ministry of International Trade and Industry [MITI] and the United States Commerce Department on auto imports by Japan documents my many contentions that United States automotive manufacturers face a host of non-tariff trade barriers when trying to sell into the Japanese market.

Even though Japan boasts that it has anti-trust laws, it has not stopped the Japanese automobile industry not only from producing cars, but also controlling the sales and distribution of the products. Since the Nissan or Toyota-owned auto distributor is not going to sell and service his competitors' cars, then a U.S. distributor must set up new sales rooms and dealerships. In Japan, because of the shortage and expenses of land—especially in the urban areas where the markets are—the additional start-up costs are prohibitive for United States entry into the market.

Now, if a United States car is ordered directly from this country or, in order to secure a right hand drive—as is the custom in Japan—is ordered from Ford in England, the minute it comes off the ship, the Japanese demand that it be disassembled to check its safety. To the contrary, the United States allows the Japanese to self certify the safety of their cars, so that they roll straight from the ship into the distributors' hands into the hands of the American buyer.

How sweet it is for the Japanese. How tough it is for the U.S. producer! And, how unfair! As if moving the car through the Japanese bureaucracy and having a service center, possibly, as far as 30 miles away were not enough of a deterrent to purchasing an American car, there are even other restrictions—some visited equally upon Japanese cars, such as certifying that one has a permanent parking space—which makes the purchase of a car in Japan a hassle without adding to the problem by buying a foreign automobile.

The argument by militant free traders that it is the U.S. industry's fault,

because "it has never produced right-hand drive automobiles" displays a shocking ignorance of Ford's prominence in the right-hand-drive English market. But, facing all of the nontariff barriers in Japan, what difference does the steering position make?

I congratulate the President and his Trade Representative, Mr. Kantor, on their tough stance with the Japanese. It's about time. In 1971, there was a \$1.3 billion deficit—yearly. By 1991, it has grown to \$43 billion in 1993, \$54 billion by November. Realize, that this figure represents the loss of real U.S. wealth that will never be recovered.

What does this mean to each constituent in our district? The economic rule of thumb is that each billion of trade deficit represents a loss of 20,000 jobs. The Japanese trade deficit added to the deficits with all other foreign nations—we have a surplus with very few nations—has created the current jobs situation about which, Robert Reich, Secretary of Labor, states:

In 1993—despite the recovery—both the extent of long-term unemployment and the average length of a period of joblessness hit their third-highest annual levels since the end of World War II.

Fewer than one-quarter of unemployed job losers in 1993 expected to be called back to their old jobs after a layoff. For the rest, their jobs were gone for good—the highest proportion of permanent job loss since 1967, when statistics were first collected—emphasis mine.

Professor Reich is a noted free trader so it is a puzzle to me that he seemingly does not connect this frightening employment situation with the equally frightening, growing trade deficit.

I hope the President's position on the current Japanese debate is evidence that someone in the White House is studying cause and effect.

□ 1520

TRIBUTE TO JOHN BRADY COLEMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WASHINGTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleague from Texas in noting and pointing out the fact that Texas lost a very distinguished person in the death of John Brady Coleman.

He was a wonderful man. He was the kind of person who held out his hand to all people. He was the kind of person who was a civic and community leader, and he devoted his life not only to the practice of medicine but he devoted his life to the education of young people.

I truly believe that education is one of the most important things that we can do for our society and that we can do for our people. It should be noted

that truancy and the lack of an education leads to more problems in our society.

Crime and all of the incidents and the flowing results from crime are largely caused, I think, from the lack of an educational system that delivers for our people. It should be noted that truancy is the largest single predictor of criminal behavior.

It should be noted that Dr. Coleman was aware of that fact, and in addition to being on the boards of regents of Texas A&M University system, and Texas Southern University and Houston-Tillotson University in Austin, TX, at different times, he was also the leading, driving force for the United Negro College Fund in Texas. He took the UNC up from the dark ages where they went from hand to hand and from house to house raising small amounts of money to a telethon that raised annually more than \$1 million that helped young people that go to 41 member schools that are located throughout this Nation and predominantly in the Southern part of this Nation.

John Brady Coleman was a wonderful man. He had a wonderful wife, Gloria Coleman, and they had three wonderful children, John B. Coleman, Jr., Kathleen Coleman, and Garnet Coleman, each of whom in their own right are making positive contributions to the Houston community. I dare say that they will be for many years.

When I attended Dr. Coleman's wake, it was held at one of the largest churches in Houston. Yet it was overflowing to capacity, which meant that people were listening outside in the cold on the loudspeaker to hear the many wonderful things that were being said in praise of Dr. Coleman and his life.

He lived a full life, 64 years of helping, touching many, many people, from promoting small groups, fledgling entertainment groups that were trying to get started in the music business, through a series of clubs and promotions that he had, to touching young people, to helping people get started with business.

He was not afraid to loan his money to people who could not get a loan at a bank. He touched the lives of many, many people, many of whom even his family will never know for sure, because Dr. Coleman was the kind of giant and the kind of man who never forgot from whence he came.

We will miss him, we will miss his legacy, and we will miss his life.

I think it is appropriate to pause at this time in the House of Representatives of the United States to pay diligence, homage, and honor to John B. Coleman for the life that he lived, a life well spent.

BURMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing a historic realignment between nations and peoples. Old empires are withering away, and new centers of prosperity are emerging. These extraordinary changes will not, however, result in a future of increased freedom for everyone.

Burma is one of the places left behind as the world moves toward new potential for freedom and democracy. While prosperous cities like Bangkok, Singapore, Hong Kong, Seoul, Taipei, and so many others in Asia distinguish themselves as thriving market and cultural centers, Rangoon lingers in stagnation and oppression.

Burma is a police state, a place where everyone's life is controlled by a heavy-handed clique of military officers and unelected officials.

The gap, between Burma and its ASEAN neighbors is being widened by rapid advances in technology and the emergence of a global market. Each year free societies take steps toward solving problems like pollution, disease, and hunger, while unfree societies like Burma slide backward. We can see this same gap in Vietnam, Cuba, North Korea, and other corrupt dictatorships.

While it is not incumbent on us to spill American blood or expend our resources to combat every tyrant, for there will always be another tyrant, it is incumbent on us to support those who are fighting for democracy, human rights, rule of law, and, in short, the values and ideas at the heart of the American experience.

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge one of our colleagues who recently took it upon himself to reach out to the oppressed people of Burma. BILL RICHARDSON went to Rangoon and stood tall for human rights and democracy. His presence was evident to the people of Burma that they are not forgotten. He clearly sent the message that we are on the side of the oppressed, not the oppressor. BILL met with Nobel Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi, and underscored America's support for her courageous vigil for freedom in Burma.

Congressman RICHARDSON's message gives hope to people isolated from the world both in Rangoon and in ramshackle refugee camps deep in the jungle. The hill tribe people of Burma, who have fought the Burmese regime, are humble and innocent people. They have been subjected to forced relocations, starvation, inadequate shelter, poor medical care, disease, and constant threat of military attack.

Karens, Mon, Pa-O, Kachin, Wa, Kareni, Chin, Shan, and courageous ethnic Burmese are members of the Democratic Alliance of Burma, standing together they have managed to keep Burma's vicious regime from its goal of total control.

Since the open elections of 1990, which the democratic forces won, but were denied their electoral victory by raw military power, the Burmese junta slowly killed, jailed, or exiled the entire leadership of the democracy movement, just as they have attacked and isolated the hill tribes of Burma.

But this has caused the Burmese regime to be a pariah among the nations of the world. So recently the regime has been trying a new approach: A few democratic leaders have been released and there has been an aggressive public relations program in Washington. Rangoon has, in fact, limited its military offensives against the hill peoples. All this to calm the voices of condemnation overseas, but not to loosen its grip on power at home.

Mr. Speaker, the democratic resistance in Burma is reeling. They are being pressured to give up their legitimate and democratic demands. Both China and Thailand have economic interests in seeing a settlement signed, and therefore they have exerted pressure on the ethnic groups to come to some kind of accommodation.

Our generous friends in Thailand, yearning for peace on their borders and friendly ties with their neighbors, have grown tired of having so many refugees inside their borders. Who can blame the Thais for wanting to settle the conflicts on its borders. But consequently, lacking any serious outside support, there are few other alternatives for those who would have democratic government in Burma rather than seeking accommodation with the ruling clique.

Unfortunately, the United States has not been the positive force in Burma that it should have been. U.S. businesses are lining up to invest despite human rights abuses and dictatorship. Some in our Government have urged cooperation and constructive engagement with the Burmese regime, nudging them toward reform and respect for human rights.

It is obvious that those who hold power illegitimately have most of the leverage in the negotiations now going on in that troubled land. Our American embassy in Rangoon should let it be known that there are certain basic principles which must be part of any solution for Burma's troubles.

Any agreement should include, at a minimum, the release of Aung San Suu Kyi, the removal of Burmese troops from the territories of the ethnic tribes, respect for human rights, and guarantees for the protection of hilltribe culture and their way of life. In the case of the Kareni, we should respect their desire for independence, perhaps as part of a confederation.

Should the fighting end, I will be looking forward to reading reports of how the Burmese regime has shifted its enormous military away from slaughtering innocent hill tribesmen, and refocusing it on eradicating narcotics trafficking in Burma.

As the Clinton administration reviews our policy toward Burma it should not ignore democracy and human rights. Someone who is a forceful negotiator and strong advocate of human rights should represent us in Rangoon as Ambassador.

Mr. Speaker, Burma is a country of over 40 million people. It is rich in minerals and has great economic potential. The Burmese people are as talented and capable as any in the world. Aside from potential beneficial economic ties and the narcotics issue, we presently have few interests in Burma. Nevertheless, it is necessary for us to pay attention to the Burmas of the world. Part of our global concerns should include the tens of millions of people in places like Afghanistan, Sudan, Tajikistan, and Burma. Places where people are struggling for their lives and their freedom against the forces of tyranny. Without our attention and concern, these forgotten corners of the world quickly turn into places where the law of blood and force rules exclusively. Because of our convictions and our powerful position in the world, we owe it to our forefathers and mothers, whose love of liberty made the United States what it is to express solidarity with the struggle of the oppressed, and to condemn the tormentors of those who long for freedom and a better life.

Mr. Speaker, these are people who have, facing great odds, risk of the death of their family and themselves, have stood against this dictatorship. I would leave one message to the people of Burma—and I commend my fellow congressman, BILL RICHARDSON of New Mexico, he speaks for us and he spoke for us when he talked in Rangoon when he spoke about democracy. The people of Burma are not forgotten. I hope they hold firm to their struggle for human rights and democracy.

WELFARE REFORM; THE GENDER ISSUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I thank the Speaker for allotting me this time and I thank the majority leader.

The matter I would like to introduce tonight in a series of special orders that I hope to take, by engaging my fellow colleagues in the House to join me, is a discussion of the whole welfare reform issue. Welfare reform has become a topic that has been linked with health care reform. It is linked to budget deficit considerations, and it has risen to prominence in terms of the Clinton administration's priorities.

Therefore, I believe it is incumbent upon us as Members of this House to

put this issue in proper perspective. So much of what has been said and what we have seen in the press and elsewhere is extremely negative criticism of people, who though no fault of their own, have come to difficult circumstances and have, therefore, had to ask for Government assistance.

If the subject matter were simply to be dropped at that point, perhaps it would not be necessary to take special orders to discuss this issue with greater compassion and clarity.

But the point that I wish to make in this hour that I have taken is that the brunt of our criticism, the brunt of our attack, the brunt of the burden of this debate is being heaped upon women in this society. It is grossly unfair to put this kind of criticism on the people of our society who are already in a highly difficult situation.

We all know the statistics as women: Women have the greatest difficulty in finding jobs that pay decent wages; they have the greatest difficulty in finding jobs that have even the slightest amount of upward mobility. We speak about being locked into a job situation that barely pays enough to stay above the poverty line let alone to survive and provide for a family of two or three children.

The statistics are there. The comparisons in terms of wages earned by women at the lowest end of the work force prove this time and time again, that despite all progress which we have made in terms of gender equity in this society, that there are still monumental problems with respect to women being able to earn a decent living and to be paid according to their talent and ability.

We only need to look at the statistics to bear this out. Women are still at the level of 60 cents to 70 cents on the dollar, based upon equal educational background and equal experience when it comes to men holding the same position.

Talk about the glass ceiling, the glass ceiling is often discussed for the higher levels, "Why don't we have more judges, more people heading corporations, more people in the professions?" The glass ceiling that we need to be concerned about is the one that keeps women in our society at the lowest level of earning, at the most menial jobs, the jobs which have the least potential of being able to lift them up to the ability to sustain their families.

It is under these circumstances that we are now debating this whole welfare reform issue.

Most of these families are on public assistance because they have nowhere else to go. I cannot believe that this great Nation is going to forget its history of compassion and concern for those in our society who are unfortunate, who have come to unfortunate circumstances, and abandon them with such harsh rules as 2 years and you're

out. It sounds something like "three strikes and you are in a lifetime prison situation." I cannot believe this Nation is going to move forward to place those kinds of harsh consequences upon these families.

The most important point that the country needs to know when we are talking about people on family assistance is that the vast majority of persons on family assistance are children. We are talking about some 10 million children, perhaps, who are on AFDC rolls. If we adopt a policy that says that the single parent can receive assistance only for 2 years, what is to happen to these children? What is to happen to the support mechanism for these children?

I believe that we need to look at some of these harsh recommendations for the stark reality that they will present to America.

All of us join with our concerns about the homeless: What do we do about the people on our streets who have no home, about families that are living in vacant lots or in car bodies or are pitching a tent on the mountain or on the seashore because they do not have the wherewithal to pay the rent and to take care of their families?

What will happen if we adopt a 2 years and you're out rule is that there will obviously be more families who will be forced to take to the streets and to fill our homeless shelters and to depend upon the private charitable organizations of the country.

One of the reasons I believe the welfare reform debate is heating up is because of the expenses that have been mounting under one of the entitlement programs called Medicaid, because poor families have a program which entitles them to receive health care when they need it. And of course in discussing the health care reform issue, one of the major areas that people are concerned about is the mounting cost, not only of Medicare but also of the Medicaid population.

So, in order to come to grips with this rising cost of entitlements, we need to do, they say, something about the welfare aspects. And it is true. So I believe that one of the fundamental responsibilities that this Congress has is to come forward with a health care reform package that will make it possible to offer, finally, universal health care coverage for everyone in America regardless of their status, their economic ability, their family situation, or whatever.

□ 1540

So that will take us one tremendous step in the direction of helping to take care of some of the problems.

I have heard many families on public assistance saying that they have to, in order to make sure that their children's health care needs are met, that there is no other way for them to pro-

vide for this health coverage, and so they maintain themselves with all the restrictions on welfare in order to protect their children. So, if we enact the health care reform proposals that are before us and assure the country of universal coverage, the part of the problem with reference to those on public assistance will be met.

The AFDC program is a program that costs about \$11.8 billion in Federal benefits. Basically AFDC is a matching program where the States come up with roughly about 50 percent of the costs, and the Federal Government comes up with 50. It is not a federalized program in the sense that there is a minimum established for child assistance throughout the country. There is a wide disparity. It depends upon the decisions at the local level.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is very much a program that depends upon what the States feel they want to contribute to the support of a family.

In my own State the support figures that go back to January 1991 indicate that the support, maximum support, grant is \$695. By contrast, Mr. Speaker, we have States like Alabama at \$124, we have Mississippi at \$120, we have California at \$694. We have Alaska at \$891, Arizona at \$293. The States vary tremendously in the amount of money that is provided to each of these families.

I have long felt that one of the solutions is to perhaps put all of this under the Federal Government and to provide a uniform support basis for the children all across America rather than to leave it dependent upon where they happen to live, and this might provide some substantial support for children throughout the country.

There are today, according to the latest Census Bureau memorandum which I just received the other day dated March 3, in America 36.9 million Americans living below poverty, and this is a 1992 statistic. This figure has increased since 1991. At that time it was 35.7 million. In 1989 it was 31.5 million.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a very high number of persons living in poverty. It is the highest number since 1962 according to the Census Bureau.

Fifty-four percent of the mothers between 18 and 44 years of age in 1992 who had born a child in that year were working. Fifty-four percent of the women. In 1982 it was 44 percent. In 1976 it was 31 percent. More women are in the work place today contributing to the commerce of this country, finding employment, providing for their families and, in many cases, at the lowest wages that that community offers. It is difficult for the families, and if something should happen to disrupt those families, divorce, death, separation or whatever, many of them have no other recourse than to seek assistance under the AFDC program.

There have been societal changes, too, in the last 10 or 15 years. Twenty

percent of the preschoolers whose mothers worked in 1992 have fathers at home as the primary care giver, and this is up from 15 percent of the preschoolers being cared for by their fathers in 1988. The statistics in 1992 show 16 percent are cared for by their grandparents and 8 percent by other relatives. Thirty-one percent of recent mothers who had a child in 1992 had high school educations—excuse me—31 percent had less than a high school education as compared to 72 percent that had graduate degrees, and so we see a changing situation among the working mothers. In 1993, Mr. Speaker, the Census Bureau advises that 80 percent of Americans 25 years and older completed high school. That is a remarkable number of people.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are succeeding despite all the naysayers in our society. Most Americans are continuing high school and finishing high school. They still have difficulty finding a job.

We have millions of people that are unemployed. It is not only the welfare recipient who has no job or cannot find one. There are millions of other Americans who have, because of downsizing of industry or whatever, lost their jobs despite having good education, good experience. They are unable to find work. Yet we find the policymakers who are talking about welfare reform stressing the fact that the solution to AFDC is job training, job search and, ultimately, a job.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that it were that easy. I believe that the vast majority of single parents, women who are on welfare, would be eager to take a job to support their families, if they could be assured that the income they earned would be sufficient to support their families and that they would have the health care support that went along with that job. And to prove that, that this is not a new idea, it is important to know the history of where we are in the whole discussion of aid to dependent children.

Aid to dependent children was established by Social Security in 1935 as a cash grant program to help families that were having difficulties, whose fathers were absent and not at home. The program provided at that time cash, welfare payments, for needy children who did not have a mother or a father at home, or who was incapacitated, had disease or was unemployed. So, it has always been a child oriented program, a program designed to help families with dependent children. That is exactly what AFDC is.

The myth out there in talking about welfare is this myth that there are all these adults out there, five million perhaps, who are receiving government assistance and not doing their best in terms of going out to locate a job, and that, of course, is not the situation at all.

In order to try to develop a new direction and a new structure for the

AFDC program, Mr. Speaker, in 1988 the Congress, in its wisdom, enacted Public Law 100-485, which is the Family Support Act, 1988. It revised the whole idea of AFDC by putting in education and training requirements. As of October 1, 1990, States were required to have job opportunities and basic skills programs. For short, we call it the jobs program. The new program is designed to help needy families with children avoid long-term welfare dependency.

□ 1550

The Jobs Program replaced the Job Incentive Program that was referred to as WIN, and other demonstration programs that had been supported by previous administrations.

The Jobs Program was required to have an educational component. The States were required to enroll those individuals receiving AFDC, provided the youngest child was at least 3 years of age, to have some sort of an educational program. They were automatically included in Medicaid, and under the Family Support Act, it required the States to guarantee child care if it was decided that child care was necessary for the individual's employment or participation in education and training activities.

So the major components of the administration's policies or recommendations for welfare reform changes are already part of what the Congress included in the Family Support Act of 1988. First, is that the States should have a job training and education component, and, second, in order to take advantage of the job training and education component child care was necessary. The State was required to provide that child care.

Under the Federal law, AFDC mothers were required to assign their child support rights to the State and to cooperate with welfare officers in establishing the paternity of the child and in obtaining support payments from the father.

That is already law. Yet we hear this proposal coming from all quarters as though it was a new discovery. It is already part of the Family Support Act of 1988, that by receiving AFDC, you assign to the State government the responsibility to locate the father, to establish paternity, and to try to receive support payments.

If the State is successful in receiving these support payments, those support payments are assigned to the State in order to help meet its contributions or matching rates under the welfare program.

So that is an ingredient that is already with us under the Family Support Act. One might ask, well, what is wrong with the Jobs Program? Why did it not work and can we not make it work?

I believe that we could. The problems arise because of the lack of funding.

The Congress has not given enough money. The States have not been able to provide enough resources and assets to make it work.

So my suggestion to this Congress is to take a hard look at the Jobs Program and to see what ways we might improve it and make the ultimate result, which was already stated in the enactment of that bill, to try to reduce the number of persons on welfare by enabling them to find a job.

That is not a very easy thing to do. You can do all the job training, and we have heard so much criticism about the 100-plus job training programs that exist now in the law for this, that, or the other kind of person in our society and what the administration is arguing, that we should consolidate all these training programs to better assure their success.

The difficulty with job training is that we do not necessarily target the training to a job availability. As a consequence, the job training expenses are forfeited, and the person still has no job there that can provide the income and the self-sustaining ability for that family.

So we have to be careful when we are talking about some sort of miracle work, such as training and education, as though it could immediately result in a job opportunity that can transfer to a family that has been on public assistance. It is very difficult. It needs counseling, it needs matching, it needs job searching, it needs a considerable amount of resources, far more than we are now willing to put into the AFDC Program or any Jobs Program.

I am fully in support of the notion that we have to do more to help these families, and I embrace all of the suggestions that have been made thus far, that we should provide more money for education and training, counseling, and go out there to look for jobs that these families could fill.

But the difficulty is it is not that simple, and it is a very costly enterprise. My guess would be that while we spend about \$11 billion for AFDC currently as cash benefit payments to these families, if we embark on a full-scale education, training, job search, job location program, it will certainly cost at least that much more for it to be successful.

Now, the proposals almost confess that they may not succeed. And the may-not-succeed part of the proposals suggest that if a job cannot be found, that it will be the responsibility of the Government to look for a community service job in the private sector, in the nonprofit sector. And I think that is fine. It is already part of the law. It is part of the family support assistance law. It is a provision called community work experience.

Let me read you a short synopsis of the community work experience part of the law.

The purpose of the CWE Program is to provide experience and training for individuals not otherwise able to obtain employment. CWE programs must be designed to improve the employability of participants through actual work experience and training, and to enable individuals employed under CWE programs to move them into regular employment. CWE programs must be limited to projects which serve a useful public purpose in fields such as health, social service, environmental protection, education, urban and rural development and redevelopment, welfare, recreation, public facilities, public safety, day care. A State electing to operate a CWE Program must ensure that the maximum number of hours that any individual may be required to work under a CWE Program is no greater than the number of hours derived by dividing the total AFDC benefit by the minimum wage.

So, what we have done in the 1988 statute under community work experience is to make people work for the AFDC benefit that they receive. So that is already part of the law. But now we are moving ahead, with education, training and trying to get them a job. If they do not have a job the plan is to put them into a community service job supported either by the local government, the State government, the Federal Government, or a local entity, with a guarantee of at least minimum wage.

The problem with that solution is that it is not going to bring that family out of poverty. Minimum wage is likely to produce about an \$11,000 or \$12,000 income for that individual, hardly enough to support a family, unless the Government has already assured them housing assistance, and has assured them child care.

That is another element which the Family Support Act of 1988 also took cognizance of. You cannot have employment and training and all of that which leads to the work ethic, unless you have child care provisions for young children who are not of school age and, for those of school age, some after school program that will enable that child to be protected and safe and not on the streets being tempted or otherwise subjected to abuse and violence by the elements on the street.

Child care is already at about a \$1 billion level in terms of Federal support to AFDC families in job training under the JOBS Program. There is a transitional day-care program for 1 year for AFDC families that are moving off welfare, and another \$300 million program for at-risk families. So we are already providing support in the child care area.

If we move to a policy which says everybody must find something in terms of work, either in the public or the private sector, because after 2 years there will be no more assistance, then there

will be this great issue of what happens to child care for the remainder of the time.

□ 1600

Is this going to continue to be a Government responsibility? If it is, that is going to add another considerable amount of money for child care.

The discussion of welfare reform is not a simple one. I have attempted to get answers from the Congressional Research Service for many of the questions that are asked of me constantly. I know that the search for information is only just the beginning. Let me give you a few of the bits of information that CRS has provided me, based upon questions which I posed to them recently.

The No. 1 point on welfare reform is to remember that when we are talking about welfare, we are talking about 10 million children. This is data dated November 1993: 9.6 million children are in the program; 5.4 million adults, 700,000 of them from two-parent families.

The two-parent families were added recently, called the AFDC Unemployed Parent Program, where two-parent families are entitled to the AFDC if, because of unemployment, they are now in a difficult circumstance. Prior to that amendment, AFDC was reserved only to the single-parent situation.

The CRS says that their data indicate that 43 percent of mothers who first receive AFDC before age 24 were short-term cyclers who used the program for a total of fewer than 24 months, that 32 percent were longer-term cyclers who used it for a total of 25 to 54 months. And then about 24 percent used it for longer periods.

Increasingly, the data, which are being provided me by various research organizations, suggest that any concerted effort that the government may make at the local, State or Federal level to help individuals find jobs will ultimately be successful, if there are jobs to be found, because these families are eager to work.

If you look at their cycle of in-and-out of AFDC, the kinds of jobs they took, hoping that it would lead to a better circumstance for their family, it clearly suggests that for at least two-thirds of these families on welfare, a job for them is a better way to go. They are anxious to do whatever they can to make that so.

Would that we could make America to be a mirror image of ourselves. Would that we could make America into a completely homogeneous all-alike society, everybody having equal potential to earn, to work, to be successful. But that is not the condition of any civilized society. There are always in our midst people who are less fortunate than we are, less able to be productive and find themselves in difficult circumstances.

I think that it has been the tradition of this Nation to not turn our backs against these individuals but to find ways in which we could help them be better off and provide better circumstances for their family, and I believe that no matter what the debate may be on this issue of welfare, that the vast majority of Americans would support such a policy still today.

The CRS tells us that of the current 5 million families who are on AFDC, it is estimated that 2.275 million or 44.5 percent have been enrolled in AFDC continuously for about 2 years. So we are talking about half of the persons on welfare who are already within that 2-year limit. And we know perfectly well that if we have an augmented job policy, job search, counseling and great efforts to find jobs, that that percentage would easily fall. So that is a note that offers me, at least, great optimism for the future.

In fiscal year 1991, CRS says that the States, in their reports, indicated that 337,000 persons left AFDC because of earnings. So that statistic would suggest, that a large body of individuals on welfare are working and are in and out of the welfare situation.

In a sample month of fiscal year 1992, according to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, approximately 274,000 AFDC parents in the JOBS Program that I just described were attending high school, were getting a GED certificate, or were engaged in higher education or engaged in some vocational training.

The budget, as I recall, the budget figures in debate on the budget resolution suggested there are about 500,000 families that currently benefit from the JOBS Program. So it is a program which I hope will be augmented with greater financial support in keeping with this current insistence that these individuals get training which, hopefully, will lead to a job.

AFDC recipients are also going to college. Of the number who are going to college and receiving Pell Grants, Pell Grants are for those coming from low-income families, according to the statistics provided me by the CRS for the school year 1991-92, there were 448,643 students receiving Pell Grants going to college and who were on AFDC. That is another indication of tremendous drive and commitment to improve themselves and to improve their family conditions.

The basic AFDC program is a matching one, as I indicated. There are no restrictions in terms of whether the States must make specific allotments for numbers of children. But all the data that I have seen indicate that the average number of children on AFDC is two, that that is the typical family size. So we are not facing a situation, as some have suggested, that people go on welfare to have children because that can lead to additional sums of money.

In fact, the additional sum that most States pay for additional children while you are on welfare is minuscule, sometimes as low as \$60 or \$70 a month.

The great issue out there that needs to be juxtaposed to this whole question of whether job training and education for the welfare recipient is going to lead to a job, is that we have to recognize, because of the recent recession, job losses, plant closings, defense closings, corporate downsizing, that there is an average of 9 million jobless workers out there in our society looking for work whose unemployment compensation benefits perhaps have already expired. And they are still unable to find a job. That is the fact of America today upon which we are trying to shove more people into the job market, where the jobs for which they qualify are absent. So the success of the program that is being suggested here is almost totally dependent upon whether we can match the training and education to a job that is available in the community.

We cannot talk about trying to move these people around to a job that may exist in Texas, when the family is living in New York or in Boston. That is unrealistic. We have to talk about fashioning training programs for jobs that actually exist in the communities in which these families live, and we have to bear in mind that it is not simply a minimum wage job. We are talking about women here who deserve better. Millions of women across the country already hold down the jobs of the least pay in our society.

□ 1610

That is a condition that is intolerable. Therefore, when we talk about gender equity and economic equity and employment equity, we have to bear in mind that our society has not yet solved that problem, so the very people that we are dealing with in this dimension of welfare reform are the very women that we are going to victimize again with low pay, unless we are careful and open up job training, job opportunities, educational opportunities that will lead them into job situations which will afford them a greater opportunity to earn more money.

In 1992, an estimated 9 million single parents cared for children below the ages of 18. In fiscal year 1991, about 416,000 infants were born into AFDC units.

One other statistic which I think is very instructive in trying to picture this situation, the Congress has consistently insisted that we fully fund the WIC Program. WIC, the program for women, infants and children, is a feeding program to help mothers across the country.

One could infer that most of the mothers and infants and children in the WIC Program are AFDC, or fall in the poverty category, but the statistics given me by CRS indicate that only 29

percent of the infants under WIC are AFDC, just 29 percent, which indicates the scope of real poverty in America where some 70 percent of infants and children and mothers qualify for WIC.

It suggests to us that we have an endemic problem of poverty in our country, and that really, when we are talking about welfare reform, we ought to be talking about poverty, what are we going to do about poverty, the conditions of poverty in our society. Truly, that is the direction we ought to be going.

So many of us, in debating the budget, debating economic recovery, have argued that the one course that we have not taken in any of our programs and deliberations is a dynamic jobs program, opening up the possibility of job creation through the injection of Federal funds into various kinds of programs. We have failed to do that. We tried to do an economic stimulus package in the early months of the Clinton administration, and it failed. I believe it is still important for the Congress to consider that.

If we did that, we could provide jobs for the millions of people who are unemployed; we could provide job opportunities for those on welfare, where it would be a meaningful opportunity for their families.

This whole issue is one that I am sure is going to raise a lot of discussion and debate in the ensuing months. I hope to engage this House on some of the issues, knock down some of the myths about this program, and to try to deal with it in a meaningful way.

One of the first things we have to do is get rid of this idea that we have to put these constraints on these families, that they cannot earn anything or they will lose their opportunity to receive any Government support. That is idiocy. On the one hand, we are saying, "You must go to work," but if you do, you will lose the support that is so necessary to keep the family together. So we have to find some way to enable a family to try to do better, to try to improve their condition, and not punish them in the process.

I have heard suggestions, and I believe there is a bill which also says that if you are below 18 years of age, no welfare assistance. It seems to me that that, again, is punitive. There are not very many welfare recipients in this category, and I cannot imagine any teenager becoming pregnant to have a child merely so that there can be some financial assistance under the welfare program.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the course of the debates we can discuss the real issue facing America that has faced us for many generations, and that is what can we do about poverty. When I first came to the Congress in 1965, under the Johnson administration, we inaugurated a war against poverty. Many of those programs have been retained.

Head Start, for instance, has become a word that almost everybody in our society understands. It has brought great benefits to the children of this country. It is here to stay, hopefully, and it is going to be fully funded one day, and it is for the children that come from the impoverished communities all across this country. It is going to make America better, because the children will have a better opportunity in their future.

I am hoping that the war against poverty that we started in 1965 has not been lost, is not falling upon deaf ears, but as we begin the debate on welfare reform, that we turn it into a meaningful discussion about poverty in America and what this country needs to do to eradicate it, rather than to punish the poor.

FELP LOAN DEFAULT EXEMPTION EXTENSION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to extend the exemption granted to historically black colleges and universities, tribally controlled community colleges, and Navajo colleges from the Federal Family Education Loan Program default trigger cutoff. This bill provides that the exemption granted to these institutions be extended from July 1, 1994, to July 1, 1998, so that these institutions, and the students they serve, may continue to be eligible to receive Federal student loans through the life of the current Higher Education Act reauthorization.

On July 1 of this year, as many as one-third of the historically black colleges, and additional numbers of native American colleges may be eliminated from the Federal loan program if we do not act to ensure that their students may continue to receive education loans. These schools were granted an exemption by Congress in 1990 from the default trigger because these institutions disproportionately educate students of lower socioeconomic backgrounds, and because elimination from the student loan program would almost certainly result in the closing of many of these schools. If some of these institutions are forced to shut their doors, thousands of needy students will find their options to attain a college degree limited, if not blocked altogether.

These institutions are not, however, seeking an exemption from the responsibility to help students to successfully manage their loans. Together with several higher education organizations, these institutions are engaging in a collaborative self-help program, including financial aid management workshops and individualized default man-

agement plans, to help reduce default rates among their students.

These schools, however, cannot carry the entire burden of raising generations of students out of poverty.

Along with other Members of Congress, I am working toward developing new, fairer criteria for exclusion from the Federal loan program. Until these new criteria may be implemented, however, we must ensure that students at these institutions can continue to be eligible for Federal student loans. Mr. Speaker, avenues to higher education must remain open for students of all backgrounds. I ask that those Members who share my concern will support this legislation.

□ 1620

THE FEDERAL RESERVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes, as the majority leader's designee.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year, certainly much more than that before I became chairman of the Banking Committee, I have been urging the Federal Reserve to fully disclose to the American public, that is to the Congress and the American public, what is behind its decisions on monetary policy. I think though that I will repeat for the benefit of my colleagues, so many of whom have expressed surprise when I have explained exactly what the Federal Reserve Board is. It is not a Government agency. It is a private corporation. And the stock in that corporation is owned by the private commercial banking system. The Federal Reserve is a federally chartered corporation whose stock is owned by the member banks. The board of directors of this corporation are appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate. But unlike any other public official, there are no provisions for recalling any board member in case their policies run counter to those of the elected Government.

There are 12 regional banks in the country which again shows how petrified this system has become. The 12 were designated regionally in 1913, long before the tremendous center of gravity or whatever you want to call it of commercial and financial activity had gone across the Mississippi. So, therefore, today we should have long ago recognized the need to have additional Federal Reserve Board banks. California, for instance, alone has an economy and financial transactions that are equal or in excess of the country of France. So the backwardness is not just in the lack of the accountability, because of the awesome power that has been grasped and usurped actually, but

actually Congress abdicated in every sense of the word, but nevertheless usurped this awesome power that no other country, no other country gives its central bank.

So with that, let me go into some explicit events, my colleagues.

What are behind these decisions that are described by this fancy phrase, "a monetary policy?" Well these are no small matters because these are decisions that have the profoundest of impacts on interest rates, employment, unemployment, inflation, and the international value of our currency, all of which are subject matters which I have been addressing in the 32 years that I have been here by the use of this great privilege which now is called special orders, but which really is under the general aegis of the long established parliamentary procedures in some respects derived from the mother parliament and in other unique American provisos that are reflected in the first rules such as Jefferson's Manual governing proceedings, and what it really is is general leave by a Member to address the House, and then about some two and a half or three decades ago it was formalized, and then given a procedure that has been called special order time.

The truth of the matter is that a member of a body such as this one has only one or two basic powers. One is the vote, and the other is his voice. So that less than 120 days after I was sworn in 32½ years ago, a little bit around 32½ years ago in the House, I began to use what is called special orders. The only thing is that some of the older Members were aghast because I would actually take the floor and make the speech or the statement which I felt was in keeping with the intention of the Congress when it set up this procedure. But, in that day and time and until much later, a Member could submit a statement in writing without speaking it and it would be printed in the RECORD as though he uttered it. I did not think that was right and so I have been speaking out since then and there has not been a year of service in these 32½ years when I have not addressed this House under this general grant of leave under unanimous consent to address the House. And the reason is that it is the only opportunity, and this is the reason this privilege was instituted, that a member in a numerous body which in regular debate be very limited to expand on a subject matter related to the legislative business, and I ask any of my colleagues who want to, or have somebody evaluate and scrutinize every address I have made since 1961 or 1962 and see if I have ever strayed from that. I never have attempted to take this privileged forum for a political stump, and this is where the trouble has come with respect to all of this ado about so-called special orders since the inception of television

coverage of these proceedings or part of the proceedings of the day.

But I think to be faithful and actually deserve the privilege, one must stick to the intended purpose that the House had in enacting the rules and providing the procedures for this privilege, and that I have done.

In a democracy, it is absolutely necessary that we have accountability. As I said yesterday, all through written history of mankind, any individual or group of individuals who for whatever reason have power of any kind and no accountability, will find themselves corrupted and working against the best interests of the greatest number, and of course antithetical to the Democratic process.

Accountability is the linch pin since colonial times as well as majority rule in our system of government, as I say and repeat, since the very beginning, even before nationhood in the colonial times in each one of the colonial State legislatures. So therefore the Federal Reserve having this awesome power, it can decide in its secret open market committee whether or not a businessman will be able to live by having a line of credit that will not make him a servant and working for a bank by charging usurious interest and having to pay usurious extortionate rates of interest that would not allow him to survive as a businessman unless he in effect becomes a slave of the lender.

So that it becomes paramount that we have the information, and the reason why these decisions are being made in secret, so that the people through their elected representatives and agents will be able to establish the justification and the wisdom or folly of such policies.

□ 1630

The Federal Reserve though lives by different rules. Rather than providing the public with a complete account of what goes on at its decisionmaking body, the so-called Fed Open Market Committee I referred to awhile ago, the Federal Reserve has chosen to continue releasing an inconclusive summary of its action, but this only after our exposure just last year after having the celebrated and historic, and it is the first time that the Banking Committee on either side ever had the full panoply of Governors of the Fed and presidents of the banks before it, and it was then that the chairman of the Federal Reserve, even though he was not invited to both hearings, we had him alone in the first one, he insisted on coming to the second one because he has rigorous control over the presidents of these 12 regional banks, and he wanted to be there.

But, by golly, he slipped and he was caught fibbing and attempting to deceive the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and that in my book is

unforgivable. The Federal Reserve, as I say, still attempts to shield itself from complete accountability and that, of course, is unacceptable.

In response to my call for a greater accountability, the Federal Reserve nudged a bit last Wednesday, took a step in the right direction by releasing edited transcripts of its FOMC meetings for the last half of 1988. I plan to continue to insist that the Fed release all past, present, and future transcripts. Without this the Congress, the media, and the public will never understand the monetary policy that is supposed to be affecting this country and whether it is in the best interests of the greatest number or just inures as it has through these recent years to the benefit of the banking fraternity.

In other words, I predict that either we move, as Alexander Hamilton said at the time he was waging the effort for the adoption of the Constitution, and the issue, I believe, is still the same, and he said,

It seems to have been reserved to the people of this country by their conduct and example to decide the important questions, whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good Government from their reflection and choice or whether they are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions upon accident and force.

And I ask my colleagues to tell me which has been happening in the last two or three decades in our great country. But I have always said that there is a tremendous countervailing of great forces.

In fact, if you study the laws that govern the physical universe you have some very basic verities, and you will find that nature always seeks balance. If you induce a positive charge on one end of a needle, immediately there is a negative charge on the other end balancing.

And people such as our great society and the people who constitute it entrust to our hands as their agents this great stewardship and assume that we have some participation in the formulation of these policies that are so vital in their well-being. Instead, we see the parable for voting that Thomas Jefferson said at the inception of our nationhood, because this is what we in other words fancily call monetary policy really means allocation of credit, who gets what, who is going to have the power to determine that, and from the very beginning of our nationhood that was the key issue as I said yesterday.

And, of course, the First Continental Congress, the Second Continental Congress, which incidentally they thought so little of such executive things as the Presidency or that they called then the chief magistrate, that they did not bother to have that kind of office. They had the Congress, the First Congress, the Second Continental Congress, then the Confederation, Articles of Confederation. But they had to have a banker, or a fiscal agent.

What did the bankers in Philadelphia do? They said, "Oh, sure, we'll lend your body the money but you've got to pay this kind of interest," and Thomas Jefferson said, "Not on your life, for that would mean that the bankers," and those are the words he used, "would rule the land and it would be like a standing army of occupation, and soon we Americans would be homeless and rootless."

What is it we are facing today like never before since the Depression, if it is not that, any why? For the very same reasons expressed in those statements by the great man, Thomas Jefferson, and so what did they do? They said, "Mr. Banker, we'll borrow. But we are not going to pay more than 6 percent." And what did the bankers do? They took it. Of course they were.

Here in the 20th century, where the United States up until 1914 had been a debtor nation, and was the reason why two world wars were won by those that we call our allies, because we were the only creditor nation in World War I and World War II, but as of 1985 we became a debtor nation again. And the system that gave the greatest boost of power, of control, to the Federal Reserve was not in 1913, or 1923 when the FOMC was created but in 1979 when Paul Volcker, the Chairman of the Fed, decided that he would use these forced measures to do what, control inflation.

But now, my colleagues, go out to your districts, go to the grocery stores, talk to your constituents, ask them if they are paying less or more for groceries than they were 10 years ago, 15 years ago. Ask them if they were paying less for lights, gas, water, utilities than they were 10 years ago. Ask them if they are paying less now than they were 10 years ago for rent or a mortgage and they will tell you, "Well, don't you know where we are? We are paying more, and in the meanwhile our paychecks," because the average paycheck of the average wage earner in the United States for the past consecutive 3 years has lost \$80 a month in net payroll value. But as of 3 years ago, and I brought that out in previous orders, over 70 percent of our families in America after the month had no disposable income.

And all you have to do is go talk to the average little folk and particularly in districts such as mine where we have an abundance of marginally employed, right below the low middle class.

So where is inflation control? Oh, an economist said business inflation has been controlled. But we are talking about bread and butter. We are talking about the absolute necessities that a family must have today to live: shelter, food, clothing, and you are paying more now than before. Rents keep going up; they are not going down. Ask anybody where in the District of Columbia; they will tell you how much they have been going up. And as I said

before on the other key items that are the cost of living.

□ 1640

Naturally, the Irish have a saying, "It is easy to sleep on another man's wound." First, we are privileged in being the trustees selected by our constituents to represent them as true and faithful agents. But above all, our pay, our rate of pay puts us in a pretty good bracket, nationally speaking. So, to those of us who are well fed, well clothed, who can go home and sleep in a comfortable bed, warm bed, have a good meal, it is not easy to go across town and see those who do not have enough to eat or the head of the household who at the end of the month, "I just can't make this paycheck stretch in order to get that pair of shoes for the child or the dress for the wife." That is what I meant by the awesome statistic that over 70 percent of our families having on disposable income.

The Federal Reserve Board is the one who dictates what those conditions shall be, like Mr. Volcker, ending in the 1970's and 1980's with such things as the so-called prime interest rate as high as 20 and 21 percent. Now, that wrecked thousands, tens of thousands of businessmen.

I reported all of that, if anybody wants to look up the records of the proceedings of the U.S. House of Representatives through those years. So I plan to continue to insist on accountability because without this there is no way we bring about accountability.

Now, the Federal Reserve, through its member banks, who depend on it when it examines them, uses them to lobby, come up here and tell my colleagues, "Hey, I hope you won't let this guy GONZALEZ cause us to lose our independence."

I have had several reports. I know that that has always happened. I am not shocked at that.

But I will say this, my colleagues: When the day comes—and it is coming—and the patient loses his or her patience, woe to this land in the social disruptions and the belated accountability that, I hope I am wrong and will not come in an undesirable way. But the handwriting is already on the wall. We have already had clear indications that the social contract that is at the base of our form of democracy has been disturbed and endangered.

Now, an inspection of these transcripts that we have been able to get reveals very interesting aspects of the FOMC works. I think it should be a major concern of everybody to know how the most powerful committee in the United States determines how much we will pay for the goods and services we buy and whether we will have jobs or employment or, more importantly, whether your share, your share of stock in our Government, which is that dollar note you have in

your pocket—and that is a Federal Reserve note, I will point out to you, and you have to pay interest for the Federal Reserve to print that \$1 note, believe it or not.

But the value of that, known as our currency, just within less than 10 years, two-thirds of the value of that dollar has been lost; two-thirds of that value lost in comparison to the Japanese yen and the German deutsche mark.

Now, how long can that continue before the value of our currency is debauched? Or—and here is where the Fed comes in because it is our central bank, it is the monetary center—where is it in reporting this loss of value? Why is it you are paying more for all that you have to buy, including the necessities of life? That is why.

But it is hard to translate one to the other no matter how hard one wants to explain it. But that is it.

But if we reach the point where our currency is debauched and if anybody thinks that cannot happen, I want to disabuse you of that, my colleagues, disabuse you of that smug feeling or thought, for it can. In my opinion, and I hope again I am wrong, the danger is clear and very present that it could.

Now, what happens if the dollar is replaced as so-called international reserve currency unit? I have been raising this question for 5 years. Nobody wants to listen, in or out of Congress, in or out of the committee, in or out of our places of power.

I have discussed it with the chairman of the Fed, who says the same thing as a couple of three big international bankers, "Oh, that can't happen, at least not in the immediate future, unless there is some day when there is great instability in the United States."

Well, that is fine, but then I ask them, Why can't it happen next year? You know, all it takes would be 5, no more than 5, of the so-called Group of 7 countries to just merge their currencies and nationalize a unit. They have already that in the ecu, the European currency unit. The European currency unit is right now worth a little better than \$1.30, right now. And all the quotations that are made in the trade in Europe are made in ecus, not dollars. Here is what it means, in view of the fact that we are the most privileged nation in history, which used to get the French leader DeGaulle very angry. He called it the "arrogant American privilege." We are the only people who have ever been able to pay our debts in our currency. But if that supplanted, it means that this huge debt structure we have now at all levels—governmental; corporate; and private, you and I—would have to be paid in somebody else's currency. And then, my colleagues, that means that we will go back to colonial times and the old mercantile system where we were the slaves of the controllers in the mother

country. And we are back, much more than anybody wants to admit who knows the facts.

Mr. Speaker, the second point I want to make about the transcripts concerns the Federal Reserve's foreign policy program—yes, I said "foreign policy program" because the Fed is issuing loans to foreign countries without congressional approval. My colleagues, you probably thought it was your duty to debate and vote on loans to foreign countries, but the minutes reveal how the Fed members debate and authorize billions of dollars' worth of loans without any congressional action or authorization. The least the Fed can do is send us minutes of these debates. Unfortunately, the monks at the money temple have edited out many of the crucial terms of the loan package. Do you trust them to handle these loans without fully describing the terms of the loans to foreign countries?

Included in the November 1, 1988, FOMC transcripts that the Fed has released, is a discussion of loans to Mexico in 1988 following their hotly contested July 1988 election. In August 1988, the Federal Reserve granted a \$700 million loan to Mexico. We do not as yet have any full accounting from the Federal Reserve about the discussions that led up to this loan.

In the November 1, 1988, FOMC transcript, Chairman Greenspan, his FOMC colleagues, and staff discuss a new special system swap arrangement for \$1.25 billion on which various amounts would be drawn. The term "SWAP" refers to the Federal Reserve's Reciprocal Currency Arrangements, which is an integrally authorized fund that the Fed can use for a number of purposes including intervening in foreign currency markets and making loans to Mexico. In the past, the Fed has appropriated itself over \$30 billion for its SWAP lines of credit.

My colleagues, did you believe that you would be consulted before the debate and vote on appropriations for foreign loans? If so, you had better read the 1988 FOMC minutes. I remind you that the Federal Reserve has fought any effort to change the law which prevents the General Accounting Office from examining any of the Fed's activities that involve foreign exchange activity or the loans discussed in these FOMC transcripts. Is that the way we should be overseeing the spending of taxpayers' money? Of course not.

As background for the political conditions in Mexico at the time the Federal Reserve granted Mexico a \$700 million loan and was discussing the \$1¼ billion line of credit for Mexico, I quote from a September 2, 1988, Los Angeles Times article:

A chaotic scene unparalleled in Mexico's political history erupted in Congress on Thursday as President Miguel de la Madrid delivered his final "State of the Nation" address amid repeated shouts of "Fraud!" and an opposition walkout.

De la Madrid was interrupted more than 10 times by protesters from both the left and the right, who charge that the government committed widespread fraud in the July 6 election in which ruling-party candidate Carlos Salinas de Gortari was officially declared the winner.

The government election commission declared a bare-majority victory of 50.3 percent for Carlos Salinas de Gortari, candidate of the PRI, as the ruling party is known. Although his nearest rival, Cuauhtemoc Cardenas, candidate of a coalition of leftist parties, won 31 percent of the vote according to official figures, there was still doubt about Salinas' margin of victory and, among some Mexicans, about whether he won at all.

In the middle of this political turmoil comes the Federal Reserve with its \$700 million loan—it even discussed a much larger line of credit. Should the taxpayers have a timely record of what the Fed was doing? Should we be told why they chose to support the ruling party at this time?

Now we know, over 5 years later, what the FOMC members were saying at their November 1, 1988, meeting. Former Fed Gov. Martha Seger said:

The day this bridge loan was announced in the newspaper, I happened to have breakfast with a Congressman from the House Banking Committee and he said, "What in the world is the Federal Reserve doing in that? Why would they be involved with the Bridge loan?"

Next I quote from former Cleveland Federal Reserve Bank President Lee Hoskins:

The concern is that we would be subject to being viewed as perhaps circumventing Congress by working more closely with administrations down the road on this kind of activity. In that sense, I don't think it's appropriate to continue those kinds of relationships because I think it risks the political independence of this body to some extent. That's my longer term concern. As for the shorter ones, I'll wait until I see what you are going to put in your telegram.

The transcript shows that Chairman Greenspan did not answer President Hoskins. Instead, Chairman Greenspan asked if there were any further questions and then said, "If not, let's move on to the domestic desk."

Chairman Greenspan, I have some further questions and I regret that they have to come more than 5 years after the fact. Even more important than this specific loan, is the question of why the Federal Reserve can engage in this kind of activity—loaning American tax dollars to foreign countries—without complete oversight from the Congress.

The third point I want to make about the transcripts is the revelation from the December 13, 1988, transcript that FOMC members knew they were changing monetary policies and following the advice of Chairman Greenspan, neglected to inform the Banking Committees of the Congress which have oversight jurisdiction. I quote from the December 1, 1988, transcripts:

Chicago Federal Reserve Bank President Silas Keehn: * * * The only question I would have is how do we explain it in the markets what we are doing. I have in mind your February Humphrey-Hawkins testimony. Are we doing something different that you're going to have to explain in your testimony?

Chairman Greenspan: What we are doing is what we've been doing, whether we defined it or not, for at least as long as I've been here. I don't know what difference we have to explain.

President Keehn: Well, I would think in your testimony the aggregate discussion tends to be on the heavy side in terms of ranges on performance relative to the ranges, etc.

Chairman Greenspan: Not in that sense.

President Keehn: I think what we're talking about is a quite different procedure with which I agree. I think we may have a responsibility to explain both to the Congress as well as to the markets that we are doing something a little bit different here.

Chairman Greenspan: On the other hand, we've stayed within our [monetary] target ranges which we have defined to the Congress—right in the middle—and it's likely that we don't have anything to explain.

This discussion clearly shows that Chairman Greenspan prefers to withhold information from the Congress even during the Humphrey-Hawkins law which require a report on past performance and future plans for monetary policy. We deserve a full explanation of why this was not done and why there is such a predilection to be secretive.

The fourth point I want to make about the transcripts is that they clearly reveal that Federal Reserve staff members play a major role in the FOMC meetings and their comments constitute a significant part of the transcripts. In many cases they are explaining policy decisions that many FOMC members then ratify. The expertise of the staff is important, but if they are determining our Nation's monetary policies there is all the more reason for a complete record of what each of them is saying at FOMC meetings and what, if any, relevant questions the members of the FOMC are asking before they ratify policies.

It was not until after the House Banking Committee's October 19, 1993, hearing on Federal Reserve accountability that I obtained Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan's admission that the Federal Reserve had transcripts of FOMC meetings dating back to 1976. At the hearing, 16 Federal Reserve witnesses, including members of the Board of Governors and Federal Reserve Bank presidents, carried out their plan to stonewall and mislead the Congress about the existence of this inventory of transcripts. I have issued a complete report of this sorry episode entitled, "The Federal Reserve's 17-Year Secret."

On October 26, 1993, Chairman Greenspan admitted a letter to me that the Fed had 17 years' worth of FOMC meetings transcripts on file. Rather than complying with my requests for these

transcripts, Chairman Greenspan wrote to me on November 17, 1993, that the FOMC had decided to release transcripts of the FOMC meetings with a 5-year delay and that they would begin issuing the 1988 transcripts in early 1994 and then release the remainder of their 17 years of transcripts over several years.

There is no valid reason for making the public wait 5 years to obtain accountability for the actions of the Federal Reserve and even less justification for pretending that editing can only be done at a snail's pace. That again is arrogant disdain for public accountability.

After my long experience with the Federal Reserve, including its performance before my committee on October 19, 1993, I do not wish to turn over the editing of these transcripts to their staff without fixed rules approved by the Congress. I am not sure what was left out of the transcripts. They say that "All information deleted [. . .] is exempt from disclosure under applicable provisions of the Freedom of Information Act." There is no way to tell if these deletions were proper. That is one reason I have insisted that the Banking Committee receive all the transcripts immediately.

I am still waiting for the Fed to tell me whether it plans to release complete transcripts of future FOMC meetings. The Fed is upholding the stonewalling tradition to protect its turf, and the immense political power it has built up over the years, by using bankers to lobby the Congress.

But I will say this to the panjandrums of power, Mr. Greenspan, and to you, my colleagues, and the privileged orders of our country: If we do not, the day will come when the people in full knowledge will rise in wrath and indignation and chase all of these moneylenders that have sold out their inheritance from this temple of democracy.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 2 p.m.

Mr. MEEHAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of personal reasons.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. ROHRBACHER) to revise

and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WASHINGTON, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MENENDEZ, on House Concurrent Resolution 218, in the Committee of the Whole today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ROHRBACHER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Mr. QUINN.

Mr. GEKAS.

Mr. SANTORUM.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROSE.

Mr. COPPERSMITH.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. SANDERS.

Mr. MENENDEZ in seven instances.

Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. BROWN of California.

Ms. BROWN of Florida.

Ms. ESHOO.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

Mr. LEVIN.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. BROWN of California.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

A bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 282. An act to provide Federal recognition of the Mowa Band of Choctaw Indians of Alabama; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

S.J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to designate the week of May 2 through May 8, 1994, as "Public Service Recognition Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 151. Joint resolution designating the week of April 10 through 16, 1994, as "Primary Immune Deficiency Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 162. Joint resolution designating March 25, 1994, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 163. Joint resolution to proclaim March 20, 1994, as "National Agriculture Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 15, 1994, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2753. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to Australia (Transmittal No. 11-94), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2754. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the quarterly reports in accordance with sections 36(a) and 26(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, the March 24, 1979, report by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the seventh report by the Committee on Government Operations for the first quarter of fiscal year 1994, October 1, 1993, through December 31, 1993, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2755. A letter from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1993, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2756. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the annual report on the effect of process patent amendments on domestic industries, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 271 note; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2757. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Maritime Administration Authorization Act for fiscal year 1995," pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Ways and Means.

2758. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a supplemental comprehensive report on the Tidd pressurized fluidized bed combustion (PFBC) project sponsored by the Ohio Power Co., pursuant to Public Law 99-190; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations, Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROWLAND (for himself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 4013. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide the Secretary of Veterans Affairs with necessary flexibility in staffing the Veterans Health Administration, to authorize the Secretary to establish pilot programs for health care delivery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARLOW:

H.R. 4014. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1968 to prohibit the imposition of

certain fees for use of developed recreation sites and facilities; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BEILENSEN (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. FILNER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FARR, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. PASTOR, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 4015. A bill to provide for enhanced enforcement of the immigration laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRANE:

H.R. 4016. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on octadecyl isocyanate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 4017. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prevent racially discriminatory capital sentencing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4018. A bill to revise habeas corpus proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 4019. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit certain severance payments to be included in income over a 4-year period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA:

H.R. 4020. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on ACM; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4021. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on amitraz; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. KENNELLY (for herself, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut):

H.R. 4022. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on the personal effects of participants in, and certain other individuals associated with, the 1995 Special Olympics World Games; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 4023. A bill to extend until June 30, 1995, the temporary suspension of duties on self-folding telescopic shaft collapsible umbrellas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. McHALE):

H.R. 4024. A bill to establish a national program of trained community health advisors to assist the States in attaining the Healthy People 2000 objectives; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WATT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. PARKER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FROST, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DIXON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. WATERS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. FORD of Michigan, and Mr. PICKLEY):

H.R. 4025. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend the cohort default rate exemption for historically Black colleges, tribally controlled community colleges, and Navajo community colleges; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DIXON:

H.R. 4026. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize appropriations for deferred participation loans to small business concerns detrimentally affected by defense reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COX, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. McKEON):

H.R. 4027. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow penalty-free withdrawals from certain retirement plans for the repair or replacement of certain property damaged in a Presidentially declared disaster; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOAGLAND (for himself, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. THOMAS of California):

H.R. 4028. A bill to empower the Department of Health and Human Services to issue advisory opinions on whether certain arrangements for the delivery of health care services and supplies are in compliance with statutes and rules establishing acceptable health care billing and payment practices and with statutes and rules defining health care fraud and abuse; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WISE (for himself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. FURSE, Ms. BYRNE, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.J. Res. 336. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for a balanced budget for the U.S. Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSE:

H. Con. Res. 222. Concurrent resolution authorizing the placement of a bust of Raoul Wallenberg in the Capitol; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

310. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to the closure of the Old Mint; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

311. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to disabled veterans; to the Committee on Government Operations.

312. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 41, a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER introduced a bill (H.R. 4029) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Aliento*; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 40: Mr. DELLUMS, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. STOKES, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 56: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 291: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 439: Mr. CAMP and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 642: Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 657: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 688: Mr. HOKE.

H.R. 794: Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. REED.

H.R. 1048: Mr. VALENTINE and Ms. SHEPHERD.

H.R. 1080: Mr. HOKE.

H.R. 1164: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1234: Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 1314: Ms. SHEPHERD.

H.R. 1457: Mrs. BYRNE.

H.R. 1500: Mr. KREIDLER.

H.R. 1517: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1627: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 1677: Mr. HINCHEY and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1712: Mr. CASTLE and Mr. ARCHER.

H.R. 1897: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 1910: Mr. MORAN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

H.R. 1961: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 2147: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 2326: Mr. CARR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. SWIFT, and Mr. TUCKER.

H.R. 2588: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2623: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. DICKS, and Ms. LONG.

H.R. 2767: Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 2886: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. DELAY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. COX, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 3105: Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 3227: Mr. GORDON, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. BACHUS of Florida, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. QUILLEN, and Mr. CALAHAN.

H.R. 3228: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 3247: Mr. WISE, Mr. KASICH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. APPLEGATE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 3251: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. MANN, Mr. DELAY, Mr. KIM, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 3272: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 3328: Mr. BACHUS of Alabama.

H.R. 3392: Mr. HERGER and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 3458: Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BOEHNER, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3472: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 3513: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3523: Mr. FISH, Mr. HOKE, Mr. TALENT, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 3622: Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 3656: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 3705: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 3790: Mr. PARKER.

H.R. 3814: Mr. FOWLER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. ARCHER.

H.R. 3912: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3951: Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. SANTORUM.
H.R. 3958: Mr. ALLARD.
H.R. 3969: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 3982: Mr. FIELDS of Texas.
H.R. 3986: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. KYL, Mr. McMILLAN, and Mr. GOSS.

H.J. Res. 276: Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. QUILLIN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. MANN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KASICH, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. VOLKMER.

H.J. Res. 303: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. APPLE-GATE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. TORRES.

H.J. Res. 310: Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. CARR, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. REED.

H.J. Res. 317: Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. BALLINGER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. MANTON, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. MEEHAN,

Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. CARR, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. LONG.

H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LAROCOCO, Mr. COPPERSMITH, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H. Con. Res. 126: Mrs. FOWLER.

H. Con. Res. 141: Mr. GINGRICH.

H. Con. Res. 156: Mr. SARPALUS.

H. Con. Res. 177: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. OWENS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PALLONE,

Mr. FROST, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. GRAMS.

H. Con. Res. 210: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H. Res. 238: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H. Res. 363: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. DELAY, and Mr. HANCOCK.

H. Res. 372: Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. SLATTERY,

Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. CASTLE.

H. Res. 377: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

78. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city of Schenectady, NY, relative to the enactment of comprehensive mandate relief legislation; which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS— ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 10 by Mr. McCOLLUM on House Resolution 295: John A. Boehner.

Petition 11 by Mr. RAMSTAD on House Resolution 247: Don Young, George W. Gekas, Michael D. Crapo, Robert K. Dornan, Terry Everett, Helen Delich Bentley, John A. Boehner, Tom Lewis, Sam Johnson, and Randy "Duke" Cunningham.

Petition 13 by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey on House Resolution 281: Thomas E. Petri, Austin J. Murphy, Stephen E. Buyer, Helen Delich Bentley, George J. Hochbrueckner, Michael Bilirakis, Nick J. Rahall, Terry Everett, Charles Wilson, J. Ray Rowland, Martin R. Hoke, C.W. Bill Young, Peter Blute, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, W. J. (Billy) Tauzin, Alfred A. McCandless, Nick Smith, John A. Boehner, George W. Gekas, Tom DeLay, Harris W. Fawell, Michael N. Castle, Steve Gunderson, Romano L. Mazzoli, and Bill Emerson.